

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. VOORHIS of California introduced a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 391) to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and regulate the value thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5748. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Alice G. Kessens and 30 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5749. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. John Allen and 60 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5750. Also, petition of Clayton Klopfenstein and 50 other citizens of Howe, Ind., opposing repeal of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5751. Also, petition of Morris Baker and 75 other voters of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5752. Also, petition of O. W. Kruse and 25 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the embargo on arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5753. Also, petition of Mrs. W. Tood Seitz and 20 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5754. Also, petition of Lillian M. Fonner and 20 citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5755. Also, petition of Ethyl Blass and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5756. Also, petition of G. M. Patterson and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5757. Also, petition of Louis A. Frantz and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging strict neutrality and no entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5758. Also, petition of William A. Stockmann and sundry citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging a policy of strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5759. Also, petition of E. N. Wedertz and 80 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5760. Also, petition of Thomas P. O'Connell, Jr., and 30 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5761. Also, petition of Mrs. William Vunora and 25 other voters of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5762. Also, petition of George W. McCoy and 25 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5763. Also, petition of Albert Henning and 25 other residents of Fort Wayne and Avilla, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5764. Also, petition of Fred H. Koopman and sundry other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5765. Also, petition of the Men's Club of the Grace Evangelical and Reformed Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5766. Also, petition of the Reverend R. F. Hart and 60 members and friends of the Methodist Church of Monroe, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5767. Also, petition of W. Mortimer Cole and 50 members and friends of the Methodist Church, of Cromwell, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5768. Also, petition of Rev. John Hagen and 50 members of the St. John's Lutheran Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., objecting against the proposed repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5769. Also, petition of Rev. H. J. Jordan and 20 residents of Garrett, Ind., opposing modification of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5770. Also, petition of the Reverend Lorance Rodenbeck and 175 residents of Garrett, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5771. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Corunna and Garrett, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5772. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. George Heck and 35 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5773. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Deagen, Fort Wayne, Ind., and 30 residents of Fort Worth, Churubusco, and Columbia City, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5774. Also, petition of J. C. Maier, of Fort Wayne, Ind., and 50 citizens of Decatur, Hoagland, Monroe, Geneva, and Pleasant Mills, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5775. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Burns and sundry other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5776. Also, petition of Ira A. Summers and 117 voters of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5777. Also, petition of Aubrey Tuttle and sundry other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5778. Also, petition of 25 citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5779. Also, petition of Mrs. Ralph L. Jones and 35 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5780. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the American Humane Association, urging that horses and mules be included among shipments forbidden as contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5781. Also, resolution of Hill Post, No. 39, Catholic War Veterans of the United States, urging their representatives in Congress to vote against the lifting of the embargo on arms to Europe and against the cash-and-carry plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O loving Master, who didst come into the world not to be ministered unto but to minister, and didst say to those for whom Thy Father's kingdom is prepared, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." Be graciously pleased, we humbly beseech Thee, to bless the work of the Red Cross, with its high and holy mission to mankind, as it ministers to the dread agonies of a suffering world. Do Thou regard, O blessed Christ, the sleepless tossing, the numb despair of the sick and dying, the penitent and the impenitent. Spare them, dear Lord, and succor those that tend them, working through them and within them, that they may share the sleep of all God's tired children—long, sweet, sound, and deep as love—until the breaking of the everlasting dawn. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Friday, October 13, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Holt	Radcliffe
Andrews	Davis	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Bailey	Donahey	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Bankhead	Downey	King	Russell
Barkley	Ellender	La Follette	Schwartz
Bilbo	Frazier	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Borah	George	Lucas	Sheppard
Bridges	Gerry	Lundeen	Shipstead
Brown	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Bulow	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Burke	Green	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Gurney	Miller	Tydings
Capper	Hale	Minton	Vandenberg
Caraway	Harrison	Murray	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hatch	Norris	White
Chavez	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Herring	Overtown	
Clark, Mo.	Hill	Pepper	
Connally	Holman	Pittman	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEADE and Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McNARY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a well-deserved tribute paid to the able and beloved minority leader of this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], in a recent address before the Oregon Republican Club, by Gov. Charles A. Sprague, of Oregon, who, among other things, urged the nomination of Senator McNARY for President by the Republican Party in 1940. I consider the suggestion a very timely one.

It is my pleasure to read to the Senate from the remarks made by Governor Sprague with respect to Oregon's senior Senator, as follows:

Senator McNARY has a long and distinguished record as a Member of the United States Senate. As minority leader he has guided the Republican Party in the Senate with skill and wisdom. He represents the best type of thinking of the Republican Party, a worthy blend of conservatism with progressivism. He is in high personal favor with all of his colleagues. He is a man of independence of judgment, yet one who is sensitive to the needs of the country.

As I survey the scene, I believe that Oregon Republicans should present as candidate for the Presidency before the 1940 Republican National Convention the name of CHARLES L. McNARY, senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent address delivered by Governor Sprague, of Oregon, be printed in full in the Appendix to the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the address will be printed as requested.

## JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADEQUACY AND USE OF PHOSPHATE RESOURCES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] a member of the Joint Com-

mittee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of Phosphate Resources of the United States, created by Public Resolution 112, Seventy-fifth Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. M. M. Logan, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

## LEASE FOR SELLWOOD POSTAL STATION, PORTLAND, OREG.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reform the lease for the Sellwood Station of the Portland, Oreg., post office, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

## PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Fifty-Fifty Men of W. P. A., Chicago, Ill., favoring repeal of that section of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 providing a 30-day lay-off of W. P. A. workers who have had 18 months of continuous employment, on account of such provision working unusual hardship on the older men who are not needed in private industry, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Polish descent on the occasion of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski—October 11, 1779—held at Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring repeal of the arms-embargo provision in the existing neutrality law, condemning recent armed aggressions against Poland and the Polish people, and also the spread of bolshevism, nazi-ism, and fascism, and all un-American and subversive activities in the United States, and pledging allegiance to the American Government and institutions, which was ordered to lie on the table.

## FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR LOGAN

Mr. BYRNES. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 192 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection the resolution (S. Res. 192) submitted by Mr. BARKLEY on the 13th instant was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. M. M. Logan, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at the National Conference of Civil Liberties, held at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City, October 13 and 14, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR SCHWELLENBACH BEFORE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by himself before the convention of the American Federation of Labor at Cincinnati, Ohio, October 12, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ADDRESS OF COLONEL LINDBERGH ON AMERICAN NEUTRALITY

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on American neutrality delivered by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh on October 13, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

## LETTER FROM CLOYD LAPORTE ON NEUTRALITY IN WARFARE

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Cloyd Laporte to the editor of the New York Times on neutrality in warfare, which appears in the Appendix.]



## NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. FRAZIER obtained the floor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, when I was submitting my observations to the Senate on the question of embargo repeal I suggested that somebody is going to be fooled as the result of repeal, either our own people who are expecting too much peace or our friends and neighbors who are expecting too much help. I have a very interesting exhibit on the subject which I should like to place in the RECORD. Across the river from Detroit is the Canadian city of Windsor, Ontario. The Windsor Daily Star, in its issue of September 21, 1939, carries an editorial comment on the front page, from which I read as follows:

The arms-embargo clause of the Neutrality Act will be repealed for a starter—and the United States of America will be in the war along about the middle of next January.

Mr. President, I repeat that somebody is going to be fooled, and it would be scarcely less tragic if our friends and neighbors were fooled than if we ourselves were fooled.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, the discussion on the pending question has been going on for some days, and the Members of the Senate are rather tired of hearing so much debate and talk upon the same subject. I wish, however, to make a statement. I feel that I have some arguments that have not been presented, or, at least, I have not heard them presented; and I desire to express my opinion regarding the proposed neutrality legislation.

I suppose this extraordinary session of Congress will go down in history as the arms-embargo session. The real question before the Senate is whether or not the United States should repeal the arms-embargo provision of the present neutrality law. The answer to that question should be based on one all-important proposition, and that is whether the repeal of the arms embargo or the continuation of it will help to keep America out of war.

We should by all means be neutral and not attempt to favor one power or to smash another power.

In the debate of the last few days it seems to me that many Senators have wandered from this point, and I have been impressed with the fact that the arguments for the repeal of the embargo have been more negative than positive. As I see it, we are asked to lift the embargo, not because it would do any positive good toward keeping us out of war, but because it would help Great Britain and France and it might not do any harm. No one seems to pretend that lifting the embargo would make us any safer, but merely that we can help the Allies and permit some profits without any great danger—that is, danger of being drawn into the present war.

Everybody says we want to keep out of war—yes; we must keep out of war—but they invariably add that it is going to be mighty hard to do it, and it may be just impossible to stay out of it. I suppose that statement is based on the facts of the history of the World War which began 25 years ago.

Most of us have a vivid recollection of the situation when the World War began. We were amazed and shocked that any civilized nations would go to war over what seemed to be such trivial differences. Then we remember how the propaganda started; first to justify each side for declaring war, and then a little later propaganda to get the United States into the war.

I want to read a part of a chapter from Mark Twain's book *The Mysterious Stranger*. This book was written several years before the World War started, but was not published until after the war was over:

I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful—as usual—will shout for the war. The pulpit will—warily and cautiously—object at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the Nation will

rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war and will say, earnestly and indignantly, "It is unjust and dishonorable and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the antiwar audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: The speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers, as earlier, but do not dare to say so. And now the whole Nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them and refuse to examine any refutations of them; thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.

This statement by Mark Twain on how a war is started is a mighty accurate description of the propaganda at the beginning of the World War and the propaganda that is now starting. Almost everyone will agree that we were led into the World War largely on what afterward proved to be false and misleading propaganda; and who knows what the propaganda during the coming months will be if the present war in Europe continues? Who can say that the propaganda will not be even stronger, if possible, than it was during the World War?

I saw a report the other day stating that there was much more propaganda now than there was at the beginning of the World War for the United States to get into it; and I think perhaps that statement is correct.

If the arms embargo is lifted, it must be conceded that it will favor one side in the conflict against the other; and favoring one side means a step toward war.

Perhaps we could take sides in this European mix-up without actually sending troops across the Atlantic; but once we yield to pro-British and pro-French pressure, are we going to have any moral reason for stopping short of war? If we let up on our neutrality and sell arms to the Allies, can we refuse also to relax our credit laws when the Allies run short of money? Can we refuse private loans, then public loans, and then the Army to protect the loans?

If we lift the embargo, it will be considered by France and Britain that we are on their side. They will come here and buy munitions and spend all their cash, and when their cash is gone they will still want to carry. Then we shall be asked to repeal the laws denying them credit. Will we refuse? The repeal of the embargo provision will definitely put us on the side of Great Britain and France; and when they want credit they will get it, just as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] told us the first day of this debate.

Some say that the present neutrality provision favors Germany. I cannot for the life of me see the logic of that statement. If an embargo is in effect, it seems to me it applies equally to both sides.

If a war boom gets started, there will be plenty of propaganda to keep it going, even at the expense of the American taxpayer. Labor in the great industries will clamor for a continuation of the boom. Steel companies will be shouting for more prosperity. Chambers of commerce and newspapers will be imploring us not to end the boom, not to plunge the country into a depression blacker than that after the World War. Propaganda will be so strong that those who voted to lift the embargo will feel in duty bound to vote to extend credit, and then one step more will lead us actually into the war.

If our country gets started in this false war-boom prosperity we shall undoubtedly be in for the duration of the war. If we really mean what we say, and want to stay out of war, why lift the embargo? Why change from our neutrality course if we do not intend to go all the way?

Only this morning I received a letter from what seemed to be a businessman in my State. He said:

Why not make as much money as we can out of this war? We need more profits. Why not make them?

Unfortunately, there are a few persons who take the attitude that we should get all we can out of the present war. I wish to touch on that subject a little further along.

The only safe way to stay out of European wars is not to take the first step but to stay out. Surely the hope of war profits would not induce us to take this action. Surely we are not deluding ourselves on that point. We know, from experience in the last war, that a war boom is followed by war depression—a depression so severe that it more than wipes out the gains previously made.

I have a number of letters from business firms opposed to any war boom. They do not want any boom to start. They say that war profits are dangerous, and they do not want the embargo lifted because they know that a false boom would be followed by a real depression.

It seems to me everyone must admit that money from war profits is, to say the least, tainted. Are we as a nation so hardened that we are willing to fill our banks with gold coined from the blood of human beings like ourselves, who have been forced into war by jealous rulers crazy for power? It does no good to say that someone else will sell them arms and that we might as well get the profit. That is a threadbare argument that cannot justify our change of the neutrality law after European countries have started a war.

The dope peddlers, the persons who sell dope to anyone they can get to buy it, and make an immense profit, use that very argument, and have done so for years. They say, "Someone else will sell dope if we do not, and we might as well get the profit." It is wrong to sell dope, however, and it seems to me it is wrong for anyone to make a profit out of war.

The statement of Hon. William Jennings Bryan has been quoted here on the floor of the Senate, but it bears so definitely on this important question that I want again to state the substance of it. At that time the situation was just the opposite of the present one. We did not have any arms embargo. We were conducting ourselves under so-called international law, and there were some persons in the country who wanted us to put an embargo on the sale of arms to the belligerent nations. Great Britain and France objected to the change at that time, because they said it would be unfair to them. Germany, on the other hand, wanted us at that time to put an embargo on arms. The question was put up to Mr. Bryan in 1915 as Secretary of State.

He then stated that the placing of an embargo on the trade in arms would be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States as it would unequally affect the relations of the United States with the belligerents, and that it would be considered as an unneutral act.

Mr. President, that was true then, and the lifting of the embargo would have the same effect today, and it would be impossible to avoid considering it an unneutral act. Our Congress, after the beginning of the World War, refused to change the Neutrality Act, they refused to impose an embargo. But later on the same Congress was persuaded that they were justified in declaring that a state of war existed. A desperate effort is now being made to convince the Members of the Senate that we are justified in changing the arms-embargo provision even after the European countries have gone to war, and at the same time the same people who are urging us to change the neutrality law assure us that there is absolutely no danger of our getting into the war.

Someone has said we have no way of judging the future but by the past, and that history repeats itself.

We were dragged into the World War through false propaganda, although we refused to change our neutrality law after the war started. Now we are asked to change the neutrality law in order to help the Allies, and, at the same time, we are told that there is no danger of getting into war. What an argument!

We are asked to lift the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the belligerent countries. Let us consider for a moment just what that means. Do we want to furnish the nations which are in this mass-murder game the instruments of death and destruction? Do we want to

take part in their selfish, greedy quarrels, even to the extent of furnishing them with war material?

A number have spoken about strengthening our Neutrality Act instead of weakening it. That would meet with my approval 100 percent.

Nations which go to war, in this day and age, are not entitled to any help of any kind from neutral nations, and especially in view of the fact that the United States was the promoter and backer of the so-called Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact, we should at least set the example of an absolute embargo on shipments of all kinds—food and everything else—to nations which have broken the treaty and are at war, and limit our shipments to surrounding nations to the average amount used in peacetime, and abolish the sale and shipment of arms and other war material at all times.

Why not? I have little sympathy for any of the nations which are at war at the present time. I had every sympathy for Poland, of course, and for the citizens of Czechoslovakia, but I have very little sympathy with England or France or Germany going to war, and especially after reflecting on the results of the World War. If we believe in peace, why lend assistance to warring nations?

I have letters from farmers in my State who produce wheat as their principal crop. At the present time they are getting 61 or 62 cents a bushel for No. 1 hard wheat, less than half the cost of production. They say that the prices are too low and that they need higher prices, but they plead, "For God's sake, keep us out of war. We do not want to have our prices raised at the cost of sending our boys to war."

There is a human and moral side of this question which has not been touched on to any extent in the Senate. If war is wrong—and we must say it is in this day and age, after 2,000 years of Christian civilization—we should not support or encourage it in any way. I was one of those who, when the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact was ratified by the nations all over the world, hoped we meant what we said in that instrument, and that the other nations did; that we could settle our differences by peaceful measures and not go to war. But I remember that at that time the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] stated that the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact would not amount to anything; that no attention would ever be paid to it. I think now that he was about right, but I could not agree to that at the time. I thought we meant what we were stating and that we were going to practice what we preached in the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact. But we did not. We immediately started to make larger appropriations for war purposes, immediately afterward, and have continued to do so clear up to the present time.

I want to quote a paragraph reported to me to be from a prominent citizen of the State of New York in reply to some prominent English friend of his in London requesting him to use his influence to get the United States to join Great Britain and France in order to destroy Hitler and the German Government. He is reported to have said:

I am not in accord with your view; shall do my best to have all Americans realize that they must not on their own, nor in cooperation with others, destroy human life. As an intelligent and spiritually minded people, we shall not regard Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Japan, or any people of any segment of our planet as separate identities, but only as members of the one human family, created by one God, who established all the land and the fullness thereof. All human needs can be realized through good will, intelligent understanding and constructive cooperation.

I wish more of our people would take that stand. Then we might accomplish something for peace.

Some of the proponents of the pending joint resolution are frank enough to state that we must help England; that England is our mother country, and that she expects every American to do his bit to help save her. We are asked to lift this embargo to save the British Empire from the Nazi menace. We are told that Hitler is a menace to the world in general, and to democracy in particular, and that we must help the Allies crush him.

Admit that Hitler is a menace to democracy. I am frank to say that I do not like Hitler's style; I am opposed to dictators. But who is Hitler, and how did he happen to be-



come dictator of the German people? I wish to quote a paragraph from an article by George Bernard Shaw, which was published in an English paper called the *New Statesmen*, and republished in the *Washington Times-Herald* of October 7. After commenting on a broadcast by the Archbishop of York, Mr. Shaw said:

Unfortunately, he began not as a Christian prelate, but as a righteously angry, hot-headed Englishman, by giving his blessing to our troops as "dedicated" to the supreme and immediate duty of lynching Hitler and his associates.

Was that not a fine dedication of the troops to come from a bishop in the church?

Mr. Shaw continued:

Now, I cannot go into the question of whether Hitler deserves to be lynched without raising awkward analogies between his case and those of Mussolini, Franco, Stalin and his associates, and raking up events in India and Ireland which unfriendly pens have represented as somewhat dictatorial on our part.

I simply remind the archbishop that, although we can easily kill a hundred thousand quite innocent German men, women, and children in our determination to get at Hitler, we should not finally succeed in lynching him, and the killing of Germans and our own losses in the process would produce a state of mind on both sides which would operate as a complete black-out of Christianity and make the archbishop's sane, final solution impossible.

If we won it would be Versailles all over again, only worse, with another war even less than 20 years off. And if, as is desperately possible, we drove Russia and Germany into a combination against us to avert that catastrophe, which is just what our Stalinphobe old school ties and trade-unionists are recklessly trying to do, then we shall indeed need God's help and not deserve it.

The pro-British attitude is very well summarized by a news item in the *Washington Post* of October 2, 1939:

**YALE HEAD SAYS ALLIED LOSS WOULD BE UNITED STATES DISASTER**

NEW HAVEN, CONN., October 1.—President Charles Seymour, of Yale University, asserted today that defeat of Great Britain and France would be "a disaster of the first magnitude" for the United States. He expressed the conviction that a German victory would "beyond peradventure vitally and perilously alter the conditions of our own national security," and would "deal a deadly blow to principles of international morality \* \* \* upon which our future peace depends."

I suppose the president of Yale University would be glad to see the Nation go into the war so that the graduates of his institution and the students there could go over to defend what he calls international morality for England and France. I cannot imagine anyone making a statement of that kind. I cannot imagine any condition in the European mix-up which would warrant sending our boys over there to take part.

Even if we grant that what he says is true, is that any argument why we should send our men over there to help them fight their wars? But he makes a very common argument, and there is a lot of talk about international morality; and throughout the history of the European wars for centuries—with a different alliance in almost every war—the principle of international morality, or some such slogan, has been used as a battle cry to cover up the real cause of the war.

Mr. President, that is a strange thing. In European wars, which have been going on almost continually for centuries, there has been a different line-up in practically every war, but always "international morality," or some such slogan, is used as a battle cry to cover up the real cause of war.

At the close of the World War, after Germany had been crushed by the Allies, with our help, a treaty was made—the Treaty of Versailles. Great Britain and France insisted on what then seemed to be unfair demands upon Germany, and over the protests of our American delegates compelled Germany to accept that unjust and impossible treaty. I think it is generally conceded that the Treaty of Versailles was and is the cause of the present conflict in Europe.

Europe is today back where she started in 1914, only worse off; more debts to start with, more hatred, more bitterness, and vastly more powerful death-dealing, so-called scientific instruments of war.

Mr. President, even before the World War began some of the nations had their scientists working upon most deadly forms of poison and gas that could be thought of. Ever since the Treaty of Versailles those nations that took part in the war at least, and I suppose other nations also, have had their

scientists working to invent more deadly gases, more deadly poisons, stronger explosives, and even working on the use of disease germs. It was developed a few years ago that here in the National Capital the War Department had scientists working on the matter of disease germs. Think of it, Mr. President; that occurred right here in the National Capital of the United States. It is an almost unbelievable situation. But it was being done at that time, and I suppose is being done today.

Senators may remember that when the war in Spain was in progress last winter it was reported that Germany had tried out some new bombs over Spanish cities. The German aviators dropped a few small bombs, and the story was that those bombs were so powerful that every human being within one-eighth of a mile of the explosion—that is, I suppose, within a circle a quarter of a mile in diameter—was killed by the force of the explosion, and it developed that the bombs were supposed to be liquid-oxygen bombs. At that time the supposition was that those bombs were dangerous to handle. They had not been perfected so as to be safe to handle or to be carried in airplanes, but I am told that such bombs have now been so perfected that they can be carried as safely by airplanes as any other kind of bombs can. That particular bomb contains one of the strongest explosives known to any of our scientists.

Only a few days ago an engineer told me that he had been working with that very kind of explosive. He said the bomb was a liquid-oxygen bomb. He said that if such a bomb fell in Washington, or any other city, near a gas container or a large storage tank containing oil or gasoline, the explosive force would be so great as to kill every human being and blow everything off the map within a radius of a mile of the explosion. He told me there were enough gas and oil tanks located in Washington so that if liquid-oxygen bombs were well placed they could blow the whole city off the map. The same thing could happen in every great city in the world.

Mr. President, I do not know whether Germany has perfected these bombs or not, but undoubtedly she has. Germany is credited with having some of the smartest engineers in the world, and her schools and universities have been among the greatest in the world.

But, Mr. President, this war is on, and the same cry of international morality, and the same propaganda, and the same arguments are being used as were used in the World War. We are even urged to save democracy in Europe. After the World War and the Treaty of Versailles, there was mighty little democracy left in Europe to be saved. We mean, by democracy, a nation of free people, sharing equal economic opportunities, equal justice before the law, and equal control over the machinery of government. But that definition will hardly apply to what Britain and France call democracy, and that is not the kind of democracy we would be saving if we assist the Allies—not by any means.

Professor Mayer, in his article in last week's *Saturday Evening Post*, says: "War destroys the democracy in nations." Not only that but, he says, war "destroys the democracy in men."

I believe that is true. War and democracy just do not go together, and when we think of England's treatment of the millions of people in India and of the condition of the French colonies in Africa we wonder how much democracy England and France are practicing. I quote from a paragraph in the *Peace News*, published in London, September 22, 1939, in regard to how the people of India stand in this war:

The Congress' statement makes it abundantly clear where the movement stands with regard to aggression and of its sympathy with Poland. It points out that, though the Governments of Britain and France declare they are fighting for democracy, past history is full of betrayal of its ideals proclaimed, and that if Britain fights for democracy, then imperialism must of necessity go wherever it exists.

If the European countries had a little more of real democracy, government of the people, by the people, and for the people, there would be some chance of world peace and disarmament. But as long as they have as little democracy as they have, as long as they are so selfish and greedy for other territories, I suppose there will continue to be wars in Europe.

Mr. President, we have here in the United States of America a heritage, a heritage that is dear to every American citizen, one that was brought to this land by our forefathers. Those early colonists came from practically every European nation. Why did they come here? They came to this country to get rid of royal oligarchy. They came to get rid of the doctrine of "divine right of kings" and similar doctrines. They came here to find a place where they could worship God according to their own dictates. They came here to be free men and women, free citizens, to have something to say about their own government and their own rights. After the Colonies had been successfully established Great Britain came over and tried to hog the control of the Colonies.

Yes; our forefathers finally had to break with Great Britain in a revolution to win their rights as free people, to secure this heritage for their sons and daughters. Those patriots had to fight to secure their rights for themselves and for others who had come here to make their homes with us. That heritage should still be maintained.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to maintain our heritage if we are going to mix up in European wars. Our early American statesmen, such as Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, and others said, "Keep out of foreign entanglements." In other words it was suggested then that we should mind our own business, and I think that admonition has equal force today.

I wish to quote another paragraph from what George Bernard Shaw has to say about democracy.

#### BALDERDASH ABOUT DEMOCRACY

No; it will not do, however thickly we butter it with "bunk" and balderdash about liberty, democracy, and everything that we have just abolished at home.

He says, "Everything that we have just abolished at home." And, of course, when Great Britain went into war it abolished all its liberties and democracy and everything else that its people hold dear in the way of government there. All were abolished. The same was true with respect to Canada after it went into the war. The same is true with respect to every country after it goes to war.

I continue to quote Bernard Shaw:

As the archbishop nobly confesses, we made all the mischief—we and the French—when we were drunk with our victory at Versailles. And if that mischief had not been there for him to undo, Adolf Hitler would have now been a struggling artist and of no political account.

He actually owes his eminence to us; so let's cease railing at our own creation and recognize the ability with which he has undone our wicked work and the debt the German nation owes him for it.

Our business now is to make peace with him and with all the world instead of making more mischief and ruining our people in the process.

After all, Mr. Shaw is about right. Oh, yes; oh, yes; he is just about right. If the United States had not gone into the war there would not have been any Treaty of Versailles. No; the nations undoubtedly would have made a peace earlier than they did.

Does anyone think that the people of Germany, or the people of England, or the people of France wanted this war? Or that the people of any country want to go to war? Oh, no; it is the little handful of dictators, the little handful of political leaders, those who are drunk with power and crazy with greed and lust for more power, a little handful of profiteers, who want war, and not the rank and file of the people themselves. It has always been that way.

The dictators, the war lords, the powers that be, are the ones who start the trouble and control the propaganda; and oh, the propaganda that they get out!

I remember that a few years ago, when one of the Army appropriation bills was before us, I took occasion to read on the floor of the Senate a few paragraphs from a little book written by the man who was the head of the so-called publicity bureau in Washington during the World War. As Senators will recall, a commission was appointed to look up statistics and give out what was supposed to be general knowledge to the people. He told how much it cost, how

much was spent, and so forth, but he said, "It was worth the money, because we got results. We sold Liberty bonds; we raised money for the Red Cross; and we got the people all thinking about war and willing to go into it." That is the sort of propaganda that was put out right here in the city of Washington, in the United States, our own home country, during the World War.

Mr. President, I remember the situation very well. I feel very strongly on this question, because during the World War I happened to be governor of my own State of North Dakota. I had taken office on the 1st of January 1917. The State administration was a Farmer-Labor organization. When the war started, the old-line politicians on both sides took occasion to call us pro-German and everything else, trying to discredit us. Every Federal appointment made in North Dakota during wartime was made at the request of the old-line politicians in North Dakota, and persons who were opposed to the State administration and were fighting it were appointed. So we had a terrible time getting along out there during those years. An official agent of the Government was sent out there to investigate some of us and to report. Fortunately, a fair-minded man came out, and he gave us a clean bill of health.

However, Mr. President, I had to make a trip to Washington to get the people who were appointed in charge of Red Cross work in North Dakota to lay off the State administration and stop talking politics, so that we could raise money to take care of our boys who were in the war. Men and women came to me at that time with tears in their eyes and said, "We are just as proud of our boys and just as anxious to see that they are taken care of in the World War as anyone else can be, but we will not contribute any money so long as the Red Cross people come to us and tell us that the State administration, of which you are a part, is pro-German, and disloyal to the Government."

I made a trip to Washington, went to headquarters, explained the situation, and was thanked for coming. Those in charge said they did not know what the situation was out there. They said, "We will promise you one thing from now on, Governor: No politics will be mixed with Red Cross work in North Dakota"; and it was not.

I mention that situation only to show that some persons would stoop so low as to mix politics and propaganda with Red Cross work. In many States there were mobs and tar-and-feather parties. Lynchings took place in some neighboring States. However, in North Dakota we did not have a single tar-and-feather party during the war. When it came to appointing a State defense council, I appointed a defense council consisting of men and women whom I knew. I knew that they could not be stampeded by the 1,000-percent propaganda. So when a complaint was made the defense council straightened it out, and straightened it out right in every instance to my knowledge. I had to see to it that some of the peace officers kept peace in their communities if word came that a meeting was going to be broken up because somebody might say something disloyal.

I am rather proud of the record we made in North Dakota. One county in the State did not have a single drafted man from it. There were more than enough volunteers to make up the quota of the county. I think only one other county in the United States had such a record. We oversubscribed our Liberty bond and Red Cross quotas every time, and I think we made a good record. Although we had quite a large population of Germans, they were just as loyal as anyone else.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator know that Breathitt County, in Kentucky, had the same distinction which the Senator claims for his county?

Mr. FRAZIER. I remembered that there was one other such county. I did not know just where it was.

Mr. President, I wish to quote another paragraph from an English newspaper called the Peace News. It is entitled, "What Germans Fear." This paragraph, it seems to me, is



very good. It is from what purports to be the viewpoint of the ordinary German citizen. I read:

He cannot forget the blockade, continued for 8 months after the armistice, when over two millions of Germans died of starvation and when five millions of his people's children fell victims to rickets and other "deficiency" diseases.

Hitler may be bad, the ordinary German workman reflects, but a second Versailles would be worse. He can see no hope, no end to the misery and wretchedness which followed the inflation and the economic ruin caused by reparations and the penal clauses of the treaty, unless either Hitler delivers Germany by force or unless the Allies pledge themselves to a different kind of peace this time.

There was much talk about "international morality" and "saving democracy" during the World War and when the Versailles Treaty was put across. The Germans were starved until they were compelled to sign the treaty. That seems to have been the situation. I am ashamed to say it, Mr. President, but our country was responsible for the Versailles Treaty. There is no question that we were responsible; for if the United States had not been dragged into the World War there would have been no Versailles Treaty.

I wish to quote an eminent authority and columnist, John T. Flynn. In the daily News of this city of September 11, 1939, he said:

There are two ways to get into this war. One is to raise armies and fight. The other is to fight on one side or the other with our economic resources. Are we going to stay out of the war on the economic front? The economic front is just as important as the western front or the Polish front in this war. It is a war between soldiers and factories and farms.

The President at one time believed that we should get into the war on the economic front. He has said so. He said at Chicago that we should unite with other nations to quarantine the aggressor nations. He said later—and not very long ago—that America should aid the democracies with all her resources "short of war." What does that mean? That means getting into the war on the economic front.

The plan is to change the Neutrality Act so that we can ship arms to the Allies. I can understand a man believing that that should be done. But I cannot understand how he can call that neutrality. I am sure the man who believes that should be done knows it is not neutrality. He knows in his soul that he wants to do it, not because he is a neutral, but because he is not neutral. He wants to put our economic resources on one side in the combat.

These are Mr. Flynn's words, not mine:

I say I can understand a man feeling that way. But I think he should be honest with the people and not try to lead them in that direction under the mask of neutrality.

We can stay out of this war. It should not be any very serious difficulty.

The President of the United States can keep us out of the war. Or he can get us in. His power to reach the public mind, his opportunities for inflaming the people, for provoking them, frightening them are great. His power to calm them, to protect their minds from inflammatory activities is great.

Whether we go into this war or not is wholly and entirely now in his hands.

Again, on September 19, 1939, the News of this city carried Mr. Flynn's statement, as follows:

The President is reported to have told his Cabinet that the Government must be honest with the people and that it must tell them the truth during this war. That is wise counsel. But when men say they want some kind of a neutrality act and use that word and that demand as a cloak to get legislation to aid one of the belligerents, they are not honest with the people and they are not telling the truth.

Again, Mr. President, this is Mr. Flynn's statement, not mine.

There are many men who believe we should take sides—that we should put our economic resources and our munitions resources at the disposal of England and France. Very well, then they should say so openly, plainly, and they should present the arguments they have for that course. That would be dealing honestly.

But to pass an act which is called a neutrality act and do it for the purpose of ending neutrality is a course which will get those who pursue it into a bad jam in history when the story of the deception is made clear.

I now wish to deal briefly with another argument which is frequently put forward by those who would repeal the arms embargo. That is the argument that we should help Britain and France defeat Germany, not so much to save democracy over there as to save ourselves. If Hitler wins, they warn us, he will next turn upon the United States and gobble us up.

The argument, of course, is absurd, but it has been repeated so frequently that many people seem to believe it. That is often so. When propaganda is repeated time after time, finally the people seem to believe it. In this connection Senators will recall the lines of Alexander Pope:

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,  
As to be hated needs but to be seen;  
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,  
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

That is about the way with war propaganda.

It is an awful thing to think of war, but with the constant iteration of war propaganda, many people finally come to the conclusion that we ourselves should go into the war.

We are warned, as I have said, that if Hitler wins the war he will come over here next. The argument, I again say, is absurd, but it has been repeated so often that many of our people seem to believe it. In the first place, Hitler has not smashed the Allies—not yet, at least—and at the present rate he never will. Hitler, in fact, has been asking for peace. The war in Poland is over, and on the western front the war seems to consist largely of shadow boxing and stalling for time. Senators must have noticed the difference between the communiques coming out of Poland and those coming from France. The Polish campaign was full of action and rather fully reported, but from the western front very little news comes forth. Why? It is not because of censorship but because of inactivity. I ask, in all seriousness, whether or not there is really going to be a war over there or whether there is not now merely an armed truce?

It was reliably reported in the press a few days ago that the French and German troops went swimming one Sunday in one of the German streams. They met half way across the stream. The Germans said that they were given instructions not to fire until they were fired upon. The fact that the French soldiers were there swimming with the Germans in the same river evidently indicated that the French were not firing, either.

Again the reports from England are full of stories about British aviators flying over strategic points in Germany, over German cities, and dropping not bombs, but pamphlets. Does all this sound as if the Allies were on the verge of being smashed? The war has not even started over there, unless it is starting now.

I notice from today's press that one of the great battle-ships of Great Britain has been sunk, presumably by the Germans, and many of the crew were lost. That is a terrible thing, but it is a part of war.

There is some possibility, it seems to me—at least I hope so—that war may yet be stopped; that some kind of peace terms may be arranged and the war brought to an end.

Last Sunday there was, according to a newspaper story, a truce between the German and French soldiers and a football game was watched by the soldiers of both sides, a football game played by the boys of a little German village near the battle front.

George Bernard Shaw, in a recent statement, says "the war is over." I hope he is correct. It seems to me it would be better, as Mr. Shaw says, to make a treaty and not go through with the war, with all its evil consequences and the destruction and disaster it will cause.

War is a crime against humanity and should have no place in this age of civilization. War never settles anything. The World War settled nothing; it merely added to the misery and suffering of the world, caused useless destruction of lives and property, and untold anguish to those who had loved ones in the war. After all the horrors of the last World War, the mass murder of 30,000,000 men, and a cost of \$400,000,000,000, there was a one-sided treaty that resulted in conditions admittedly a thousand times worse than conditions which prevailed at the time the war started. There were almost unnamable aftereffects, including the bankruptcy of the nations that took part in the war and the bankruptcy of the people of those nations, resulting in a depression that has lasted all these years, in panics and unemployment, which have cost many more billions of dollars. Then there followed a mad, crazy rush for armaments, which naturally resulted

in the present war, which is bound to mean more destruction, untold suffering, vastly greater debt and bankruptcy, more dictators, and again the inevitable aftermath.

A newspaper story stated the other day that the war in Europe was costing \$12,000,000 a day. Such a sum will quickly run into a tremendous amount of money; it will soon bankrupt those nations. They cannot go on indefinitely; oh, no; they cannot go on for very long unless the United States backs the Allies, and especially backs them with money.

Some seem to think that the Allies are stalling on the western front and waiting to see what the United States is going to do. At any rate, many people have been wondering why England and France took so little part in Hitler's conquest of Poland, after they had faithfully promised to aid Poland, and why England apparently has not gotten really started in the war up to date.

Mr. President, I happened to be over in Europe during the week just before the war started, and on the ship coming home there came over the radio a statement from leaders in England. I remember a statement one evening very definitely. The speaker was telling about a speech that had been made on the floor of the House of Lords by one of the leaders there. I recall he said, "Great Britain always keeps her pledges." I immediately thought of the debt that England owes us. That is one pledge she forgot to keep.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Is it not true that the nonaggression pact between Poland and England covered the invasion of Poland by Russia?

Mr. FRAZIER. I think it did.

Mr. HOLT. If England was actually interested in protecting Poland, why has she not declared war on Russia?

Mr. FRAZIER. That is another thing that I wonder about, too. England had promised definitely that she would not back down on her promise to protect Poland, but, so far as I know and so far as the Associated Press reports and the radio reports have indicated, she did nothing to protect Poland; she sent not a single plane or any troops to aid Poland.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MINTON. Germany also had a nonaggression pact with Poland, did she not?

Mr. FRAZIER. That may be. I am not upholding Germany's attitude in the least; that is, Hitler's part in it. I do not think the people of Germany want war any more than do our people or the people of England, but they have been led on by propaganda; they have been brought under the terror and fear, I suppose, of a dictator, and they have been compelled to go into the war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. FRAZIER. I gladly yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as we are staying out of the war, I do not suppose it is our duty here in the Senate to pass judgment on the conduct of the British and the French in regard to Poland. I presume, however, the Senator knows that France could not have gotten into Poland without marching through Germany or else marching through some neutral nation and violating its neutrality. So, also, England could not get an army to Poland without sending it by ship. I doubt very much whether England could have gotten much of an army into Poland in time to have saved Poland, because it would either have been compelled to march it over neutral territory or land it in Danzig, which was supposed to be a neutral port until the German army took it over. So, regardless of what we, more than 3,000 miles away from the scene of action, may think of it, I doubt very much whether we are in a position to pass judgment on the ability of either England

or France to get an army into Poland in time to save Poland before Germany overran it.

Mr. FRAZIER. I think that is very true; but after hearing the English radio broadcast and what they were going to do to protect Poland, it seems to me a little strange that not a single effort seems to have been made to send troops there by ship or send any bombing planes or anything else.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will agree that battles are not fought over the radio.

Mr. FRAZIER. I appreciate that is a fact; but peoples are led into battles by propaganda that goes out over the radio. Of course, it is understood that such radio propaganda is censored very severely in all European countries.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume I should exempt political battles from the statement I made.

Mr. FRAZIER. At any rate, Poland has suffered to a great extent, although she put up a wonderful fight, apparently, but terrible havoc has been wrought there. Of course, Hitler tries to defend his act by saying that Poland was a part of the original German territory; that it was necessary for the Germans to save their people, and all that kind of thing. It, however, does not make sense to me. At any rate, there was no help given by Great Britain, at least. France started the war on the western front against Germany, which undoubtedly kept some of the German troops from going to Poland and caused some of them to be sent back to the west. However, nothing was done that really helped the Poles to save their country. Of course, there may be very good military reasons why England and France are stalling at this time, and yet the fact remains that the Allies will have carried the war to Germany. Hitler says he is ready to make peace. However meretricious the gesture may be and however bound in honor the Allies are not to accept a peace now, the fact remains that if there is a war it will have to be forced by the Allies, and they would hardly force such a war if they expected defeat.

The first point, then, is that Hitler has not smashed the Allies, but if he is strong enough to do so there will be no war unless the United States gives evidence of its willingness to back the Allies.

The second point is that if the war does go on England and France are probably strong enough to defeat Germany, if Russia stays out, and there does not seem to be any great likelihood of Russia actively taking part in the war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the Senator understand that what is going on at present on the western front is chiefly shadow-boxing, waiting for us to get in? I understand that the only casualty on the western front so far was a man who had his foot run over by a truck. [Laughter.]

Mr. FRAZIER. I made a statement along the same line a little while ago. I think that is about the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not complain, does he, that more men have not been killed on the western front?

Mr. FRAZIER. Certainly not. I should like to see the war stopped at once. I have hoped that our President would intervene and be successful in stopping the war. I know he tried to induce Germany and the other countries not to go to war, but without success. I hope he will be able to stop the war now that Germany has offered to make some sort of a treaty. Perhaps it is impossible. I do not know; but, after all, it seems to me, as some one has said, that there never has been a good war or a bad peace. I think the person who said that was correct in his statement. In my opinion, almost any kind of a peace would be far ahead of going on with this war.

Wars are fought on industrial as well as military strength. It is the horsepower of the nation, as much as the manpower, that determines its fighting ability.



The combined resources at the command of France and Great Britain are so great that Germany would have to draw a world of support from some other countries in order to stand much show of winning this war; and, especially if Great Britain can maintain the blockade, there would seem to be little chance of Germany's carrying on the war for any great length of time.

In presenting the first two points against the argument that Hitler will attack the United States, however, I am not under the delusion that the American people will be much reassured by a statement that it is impossible from the European angle. They have seen too many "impossible" European situations develop in the past few years.

So I pass to the third point: That with our present and projected national-defense establishment it will be impossible for Hitler and any conceivable set of allies successfully to attack this continent.

Why do I say this? First, because there are 3,000 miles of Atlantic Ocean between Germany and the United States. Second, because for the past 6 years we have been repeatedly told here in this Chamber that we were appropriating hundreds of millions—yes, billions—of dollars for adequate defense. The President himself has preached the same doctrine—"adequate defense," "adequate Navy," "adequate Army," "adequate air forces." What for? For adequate defense.

During the past few years, in my opinion, the term "adequate defense" has been overplayed. I have made a great deal of fun of it here on the floor of the Senate and in other places. Various persons have different definitions of "adequate defense," but at least they call the kind of defense they have been advocating "adequate defense."

We have made tremendous appropriations; we have built a Navy second to none; we have increased our Army; we have increased our air forces. Since the World War we have expended billions of dollars for war purposes. During the past 6 years the United States Congress has appropriated an average of more than a billion dollars a year for war purposes for adequate defense, if you please. Six billion dollars have been appropriated in peacetimes in the past 6 years for this so-called adequate defense. If we have not adequate defense, it seems to me it cannot be because we have not appropriated enough money to get almost any kind of a defense. We have appropriated more money by far than we have ever spent in this Nation before in peacetime for war purposes.

We are so well equipped at the present time that our war lords seem to be mighty anxious to get into the present insane mix-up in Europe to try out our war paraphernalia. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] the other day, in his remarks in debate, mentioned the fact that the Assistant Secretary of War was out trying to inflame the people and get them ready for war, and that certainly is what that official's statements sounded like.

We have led the world in our crazy race for armaments—for aggressive warfare? Oh, no! No money for aggressive warfare. That would be a terrible thing. The Congress never appropriates any money for aggressive warfare, and no other nation does until war is imminent—oh, no! Our appropriation of \$6,000,000,000 during the past 6 years was for "defensive purposes"—for "adequate defense." If anyone should suggest that that money was for aggressive warfare, those who favored it would hold up their hands in holy horror and say, "We do not want to be aggressive. We do not want any more territory. We do not want to go into any war, but we want adequate defense." Yes; that is what they have said for the past 6 years, especially—that they wanted "adequate defense"—and we are supposed to have it at this time. But now we are told that, "if we don't watch out," Hitler will come over here some dark night and capture us, bag and baggage. What an argument!

Many of our military experts have repeatedly held that there is little danger of an attack from foreign nations as long as we have 3,000 miles of sea between us and the foreign countries. Colonel Lindbergh spoke over the radio last night,

and made some very strong statements in regard to the pending question and against lifting the embargo. He said that, in his opinion, to do so would be a step toward putting us into the war, and I think he was correct.

After listening for several days to the arguments for the repeal of the arms-embargo provision, I feel forced to the conclusion that it must be for the sole purpose of helping Great Britain and France. Then the question naturally arises, "Why?" Surely not for the antiquated argument of saving democracy in Europe. They have mighty little democracy to save, and if they cannot save it for themselves, we cannot save it for them. Surely not because we are under any moral or any other kind of obligation to them. Let us see.

We will not go back to early history—only back to the World War. I believe everyone here will admit that we were dragged into that war through false propaganda emanating from Great Britain and France.

We went into the war. We furnished them with food, clothing, munitions, money, and with armies, to stop the Germans on their drive to Paris.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says everybody admits that we were dragged into the World War through false propaganda issued by Great Britain and France. I certainly cannot let a statement like that go unchallenged. Not only does not everybody admit it but very few persons claim it who are familiar with the situation which existed here from 1914 to 1917.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives at that time. Many persons who are now Members of the Senate were Members of the House at that time. I voted for the declaration of war. I certainly was not actuated by propaganda, and I do not think anybody else in Congress was actuated by propaganda; and certainly President Wilson, when he came before Congress asking for a declaration acknowledging the existence of a state of war that was forced upon us by Germany on account of the unlawful attacks upon our citizens and commerce, was not actuated by propaganda. Propaganda did not sink our ships. Propaganda did not murder our citizens.

I do not think the statement ought to be allowed to go unchallenged that everybody admits that we were dragged into the war in 1917 by false propaganda.

Mr. FRAZIER. I did not by any means mean to insinuate that the Members of Congress at that time were led by false propaganda, realizing at the time that it was false propaganda; but there was a great deal of propaganda which afterward proved to be false.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there was propaganda on both sides.

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. And not only was there a great deal of propaganda but the propaganda was executed by sabotage and attacks of all sorts with which we are familiar. That, however, was not what led us into the war. I think the Members of Congress who were here at that time properly assessed and evaluated the propaganda on both sides. It is not historically accurate to make the statement that we were dragged into the war by propaganda and that everybody admits it.

Mr. FRAZIER. Statements have been repeatedly made by Members on the other side of the Chamber that we were dragged into the World War.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not make any difference on what side anybody makes that statement. Everybody is entitled to his own opinion about the causes that took us into the World War; but I rose to deny the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota that everybody now admits that we were dragged into the war by false propaganda. It is not accurate.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, certainly the people of the Nation were made war conscious and led to change their views, and apparently became willing to go into war, through the

propaganda that went out, at least 99 percent of which was false, in my opinion.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall that following the sinking of the *Lusitania*, at which time 124 Americans were drowned—

Mr. FRAZIER. There is some history about the sinking of the *Lusitania*, if the Senator wants to go into that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I say that following the sinking of the *Lusitania*, at which time 124 Americans lost their lives, a former President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, urged that we go into the war as a result of its sinking. Does the Senator say that was the result of English or French propaganda?

Mr. FRAZIER. Did the Honorable William Jennings Bryan urge that we go into war on account of it?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did the Honorable William Jennings Bryan think there was any need of our going into war?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I agree that Mr. Bryan resigned as Secretary of State because he did not want to be Secretary of State at a time when we would be involved in war. But the Senator is talking about propaganda, and I am asking him whether he thinks that Theodore Roosevelt was actuated or influenced by English or French propaganda when, following the sinking of the *Lusitania*, he declared that we should go into the war on account of it.

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, Theodore Roosevelt was a war man himself, had been a great soldier in the past, during the Spanish-American War. I heard him speak before the United States got into the World War, urging that we should get into the war. I think Theodore Roosevelt would have taken us into the war, if he had had his way, right from the start, even before the *Lusitania* was sunk.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the point is that he and many others were not influenced by propaganda.

Mr. FRAZIER. I am not so sure of that; and, of course, I am of the opinion that the English were to blame for the Americans going on the *Lusitania*. That was an armed ship and carried ammunition, and the Americans had no business on that ship. They should have been warned to keep off it, just as Mr. Bryan contended.

Mr. BARKLEY. How can it be said the British were responsible for those Americans being on the ship, unless the mere fact that it was an English ship which was sailing out of New York should be charged to the British Government as fixing responsibility for our people getting on it? The German Government itself, on the day before the ship sailed, issued a warning against Americans getting on any ship.

Mr. FRAZIER. Was any warning issued here, from the Capital of the United States, against them going on it?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; there was not. But the thing which resulted in the long controversy from 1914 to 1917 was the insistence of our Government that Americans, who had the right under international law to do business and to travel, should be protected, and that wherever ships were to be sunk they should be sunk in accordance with the rules of international law, providing for the safety of passengers. We are abandoning all that in the proposed legislation we are now considering. We are not undertaking to change international law, but we are suspending its operation so far as our citizens are concerned, in order that we may avoid the very sort of incidents and controversies that led us into the war in 1917.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether he is familiar with the latest historical conclusions, which I think are unanimous, concerning the sinking of the *Lusitania*, about which the Senator from Kentucky has spoken. As I understand, the opinion is now unanimous that the British Government probably acquiesced in the sinking of the *Lusitania* in order to create propaganda in the United States; that the *Lusitania* was sent out without any naval protection, traveling at half speed, under conditions of warning of her sailing that made it almost a cer-

tainty, to the knowledge of the British Government, that the *Lusitania* would be sunk. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota—and I shall not interrupt him now to develop it—that later on in the discussion I will have the proof of the conclusions of the historians to that effect. If I may, I should like to make this comment, that the point raised by the Senator from Kentucky that we were not influenced by propaganda, is not borne out by the facts, because it is now agreed that that probably was one of the most horrible examples of propaganda the world has ever known.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senator from North Dakota, but I am surprised to hear the Senator from California say that it is unanimously admitted now by historians that Great Britain was responsible for the sinking of her own ship, and the destruction of more than 1,200 lives, in order to drag the United States into a war. I have read the statement of the captain of the submarine which sank the *Lusitania*, and it will stir any man's heart to read the statement of the man who himself directed the torpedo which resulted in the sinking of that ship. I shall not go into it, but there has been a question whether the captain of the *Lusitania* exercised wisdom in the course he took in returning his ship to Europe. At the time she was sunk he was zigzagging in order to avoid the very danger which overtook him, and there have been naval experts who have criticized the captain of the *Lusitania* because he did not pursue a straight course, so as to avoid suspicion, and outrun the submarine; but I have never heard anyone criticize the British Government because the captain of the *Lusitania* was zigzagging, as they all did, in order that he might elude the submarine which was after him.

Mr. FRAZIER. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will be on the floor when the Senator from California makes his statement next week. I have heard the statement the Senator from California has repeated, and I did not want to put it as strong as he did, but I do think that Great Britain had much to do with and was largely responsible for the Americans going on the ship, and over the protest of the Honorable William Jennings Bryan. He pleaded with the President of the United States at that time to warn people to keep off it. They were not warned, but were allowed to go on board, and were sunk.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator realizes that war was not brought about by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and while 124 Americans were killed, there was a long series of notes and diplomatic representations on both sides. The controversy was finally adjusted by the German Government agreeing to relax in its submarine warfare, and following that understanding, the relations between this country and Germany, during 1916, materially improved. No one contended on the part of the Government of the United States that we were going to war because of the sinking of the *Lusitania*. Later on, of course, the unrestricted submarine warfare was declared, and Germany announced that any ship from any nation carrying anything would be sunk, and that was when the crucial situation arose which resulted in the severing of diplomatic relations.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLT. Discussing the importance of propaganda in connection with our entrance into the World War, no one can deny that propaganda was used to stir the emotions of Americans to a condition of nonneutrality, just as is being done now. Of course, when that was done, it made it easy for the administration not to be neutral. No one can say that the people of the United States were neutral when they were lending money to the Allies with which to wage war.

Mr. Lamont, of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co., testified before the committee that we were not neutral from the start. Why were we not neutral? It was because of the propaganda which came into the United States, making it easy for the United States Government to take sides with the Allies. That was the danger of propaganda, just as it is the danger of propaganda today. It makes it easy for the administration, which does not want to be neutral, to take sides with the Allies.



Mr. FRAZIER. I thank the Senator. The mention of the sinking of the *Lusitania* brings up many old recollections. The sinking of the *Lusitania* was used as a basis of propaganda to get our people into a frame of mind for war. Even the Members of Congress, themselves, did not know what the conditions were when the Americans went on the *Lusitania* and were sunk.

Mr. HOLT. A statement was made in England by an English public official to the effect that "if we could sink another *Lusitania*, we could get the United States in immediately."

Mr. FRAZIER. I have heard something about that statement; I do not know how authentic the information is. But a great deal of propaganda is being spread now, as it was being spread during the World War.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator, Who sank the *Lusitania*?

Mr. FRAZIER. I suppose it was a German submarine. The Senator was not in the Chamber when that was being discussed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am here now. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLT. The *Lusitania* carried more than 5,000 cases of ammunition for the Allies, with which to kill Germans.

Mr. FRAZIER. There were guns on board, too.

Mr. HOLT. In other words, Germany should sit back and allow the transportation of guns with which Germans were to be killed. Then it is said we were neutral.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Americans who went on that ship were not warned to stay off it. Even in spite of the insistence of the Honorable William Jennings Bryan that they be warned, the President refused to warn Americans not to go on the ship, and when the indisputable evidence was brought to him that there were munitions of war on her and that the ship was armed, contrary to all international law as to ships carrying passengers, the President refused to call the ship back, as it could easily have been called back when it first started out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator think it was right or wrong to sink the *Lusitania*?

Mr. FRAZIER. I think it was wrong, decidedly wrong. I think it was wrong, too, that those Americans were allowed to go on her without being notified that they were likely to be sunk.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Does the Senator from North Dakota also think it was wrong for the *Lusitania* to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war? In other words, let us start with the premise of the ship leaving the harbor. Let us begin at the point when the *Lusitania* left New York harbor. Do not let us begin at the point out in the ocean where she was sunk.

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes, Mr. President, I think it was absolutely wrong for the *Lusitania* to carry munitions of war, to be armed, and to carry passengers under the guise of being a passenger ship. That was absolutely wrong. I believe it did more than anything else to get us into the war. I remember the circumstances surrounding the sinking very well, and I can go further into a discussion of the question if any Senator wishes me to do so.

Mr. President, I remember particularly the attitude taken by the distinguished father of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette]. He made a speech in a great auditorium in St. Paul, and I happened to be the chairman of that meeting. He mentioned the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and explained the circumstances surrounding it. Some representative of the Associated Press misquoted him—in my opinion, deliberately misquoted him to get him into trouble. What happened? After the Senator returned to Washington the newspapers were full of headlines to the effect that he was pro-German, and that sort of thing. A resolution was introduced in the Senate for an investigation of Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin. Pursuant to the resolution a committee was appointed. It never met to investigate him, however, although the Senator from Wisconsin pleaded with them to hold the investigation so he could clear his record. The

committee, however, never held the investigation. The story was that members of that committee got in touch with William Jennings Bryan to find out what he was going to say if he was called before the committee to testify concerning Senator La Follette, and Mr. Bryan told them he would testify to the truth. And the hearing was never held.

So, Mr. President, if anyone wishes to refer to the *Lusitania* sinking, I will say that I happen to remember something about that situation myself. Many other persons remember it also, especially those who had friends on that ship when it went down, and who were not warned to keep off of it.

I was talking about the suggestion of our owing anything to Great Britain and France which would justify us to go into their war. We went into the World War and we furnished them with food, clothing, ammunition, and money, and arms, and men to stop the German drive to Paris. Mr. President, it was the American soldiers who stopped that German drive to Paris. There is no getting away from that. Perhaps they will not acknowledge it now, but at the time it was acknowledged, and it was true without any doubt. It was our boys who stopped that drive to Paris. Then, after the armistice was signed, came the Treaty of Versailles. Was that our treaty? No; it was no more our treaty than was the World War our war—not a bit. But Britain and France insisted upon that treaty. They starved Germany into signing it. England and France forgot all about international morality in that Treaty of Versailles. They forgot all about all their democracy, too, in that Treaty of Versailles. They forgot everything except their greed for power and their desire for revenge. I repeat, the Treaty of Versailles is responsible for the present war in Europe.

England and France needed more money to help them get on their feet after the war was over after the armistice was granted. We loaned them the money, running into billions of dollars, expecting that it would be paid back. But it was not. No; the debt was practically repudiated, and the American taxpayers are today holding the bag. The American taxpayers are today paying the interest on that debt. They are paying the interest and the principal on the money loaned to Great Britain and France after the war was over to help put them on their feet.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Has not England said one reason they are fighting this war is to make those individuals and nations who do not live up to their agreements live up to their agreements?

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, that may be one excuse for fighting the war, but it is not the reason by any means.

In view of all this, I want to ask in the name of common sense if we owe England and France anything that would justify us in going into the present war on their side.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Do we owe Germany anything which would justify us in continuing the embargo which distinctly helps her by refusing arms and munitions to England and France?

Mr. FRAZIER. I cannot quite agree with the Senator from Texas that the continuation of the embargo helps Germany. That statement has been made here frequently, but no evidence has been presented to back up that opinion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the embargo help England and France?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; I do not think it does.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the repeal of the embargo help England and France?

Mr. FRAZIER. I think it would.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then keeping it is helping Hitler and Stalin, is it not?

Mr. FRAZIER. Well, I think that is a very slim argument. They are helped by not repealing it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Does not the Senator think it is more important for us to legislate for what will help the American people than what will help foreign countries?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes. I think so; absolutely. And I think the way to stay out of the present war is to stay out of it and not take the first step into getting into it. There should be no mixing in European affairs, in my opinion.

Mr. President, in my opinion, we were made fools of in the World War. Then we had it rubbed in by the repudiation of the debts; of the loans we made after we went in. Those owing us even called us "Uncle Shylock" after the war was over. Oh, yes; they talked very nicely to us while the war was on, when they wanted us to come into it; but after the war was over it was "Uncle Shylock."

Mr. President, I ask in all seriousness, Are we to be fooled again? I think the Senator who happens to occupy the chair will remember the story of the old Indian, I think it was down in his own State, who said:

If Indian fooled by white man once—bad white man. If Indian fooled by white man twice—bad Indian.

In other words, the Indian would not be fooled the second time. That is characteristic of the American Indian. If the United States failed to keep its peace with the Indians, they just did not trust us any more. The Indians have a stronger characteristic along that line than the white people, in my opinion.

Many Senators undoubtedly recall reading the purported interview of some New York newspaperman with Winston Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty of Great Britain in the Cabinet during the World War, who was appointed to the same position recently, wherein Mr. Churchill was supposed to have said that if the United States had not gone into the war, had stayed out of it, that it would have been better for all concerned, and that the treaty would have been made in the spring of 1917, and so forth, and saved the lives of many of their soldiers. It seems to me to be a rather strange statement. I remember reading it some time ago.

The one who was supposed to have had the interview with Mr. Churchill was William Griffin, editor of the New York Enquirer. I have met Mr. Griffin and have talked with him. He seems to be a very eminent gentleman and conscientious and fair. I could hardly believe that he would misstate a proposition of this kind. But a newspaper story just a few days ago was to the effect that Mr. Churchill had flatly and emphatically denied having made such a statement, and called it a lie. This newspaper story said that it was understood that Mr. Griffin had brought suit of some kind against Mr. Churchill because of what he had said in denying the interview. Of course, we have all heard of interviews that later have been contradicted and called lies.

I wish to say just a word about the cash-and-carry provision in the present measure. The cash part of it, in my opinion, is a misnomer, because it provides for a 90-day credit.

It is hardly fair to say that a 90-day credit extended to a country at war is cash. It is hardly fair, hardly reasonable, hardly logical.

Then the question naturally arises, Who is going to furnish this 90-day credit for arms, ammunition, and implements of war? Certainly the munitions companies will not do it, and certainly the airplane-manufacturing companies will not furnish airplanes and bombs to a warring nation on a 90-day credit basis or on any credit at all. Oh, no. The cash-and-carry provision in the old law which expired a few months ago was all right, and should have been continued, in my opinion. But the pending measure would also change the neutrality law after the war had started, and might again raise the question of international law. It seems to me it is not the proper kind of a cash-and-carry provision.

The cash-and-carry and the credit provisions with warring nations recall to my mind something that occurred during the last session of Congress when the War Department appropriation bill was under consideration. Some Senators may remember that a provision was made to appropriate \$2,000,000 a year for 5 years for what was called an educational fund in the War Department. That was approved June 16, 1938. Then the War Department came back and said that the amount carried in the War Department bill was not enough for education.

What was the educational money used for? I will tell you in a moment. Perhaps some Senators have forgotten about it. They came back a little later and asked for more money. They wanted \$14,250,000 additional. That was for educational purposes, too; and that appropriation was approved a little later. It was for educational purposes: "For placing educational orders to familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character, as authorized by law, fiscal year 1940, \$14,250,000." That was their statement or explanation as to what the money was for.

A story was current at the time to the effect that our rifle companies and those who made arms just could not manufacture arms, even for their own Government, unless the money was in sight. The Assistant Secretary of War went before the Military Affairs Committee of the House and told about a contract which the Department had with one of the rifle companies. He said that the contract was let to the lowest bidder, which was the Winchester Repeating Arms Co., for \$1,384,500. The contract was for making jigs, dies, and tools for the making of rifles. The Department let a contract to the Winchester Repeating Arms Co. for 500 rifles, Mr. President, and these tools, for \$1,384,500. The Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Johnson, told the committee further that the purpose was to make tools enough so that in the event of war the Winchester Arms Co. could make rifles for the War Department at the rate of 10,000 a day; and this was a part of the industrial mobilization work about which we now hear so much. The work is well under way, although the industrial mobilization bill has not yet been passed, and, as I understand, has not been introduced, in the present session of Congress, although it was introduced in the previous session, but got nowhere.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator that I was the one who introduced the various bills comprising the industrial mobilization plan and the war mobilization plan of the War Department. I did so because I discovered that the plans were in existence and had never been sent to Congress, but were being reserved so that they could be set up after a declaration of war by Congress, to be passed under whip and spur, without consideration. I thought the Congress ought to be advised of the character of the plans. I myself introduced the bills and had them referred to the Munitions Committee, which reported them adversely.

Mr. FRAZIER. In the present session?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; this was 4 or 5 years ago.

Mr. FRAZIER. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

In the House the committee asked the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Johnson, what his justification was for the estimate for this appropriation, and for the \$1,384,500 to the Winchester Repeating Arms Co. Mr. Johnson said:

It is an interesting story, Mr. Congressman.

This statement is found in the printed hearings on the supplementary military appropriation bill for 1940. This particular hearing was started on Tuesday, May 16, 1939. Mr. Johnson said:

It is an interesting story, Mr. Congressman, that in connection with the things that are coming to our attention now we are getting full record of what happened in the World War.

This statement was made in May of this year. Twenty-two years after the war closed, the War Department is giving a full record of what happened in the World War. Mr. Johnson was passing on the record to a committee of the House. He said:

There is a story we might tell here, if we needed any justification for what we ordinarily seek in an educational order. There was a conference in Berlin which was presided over by the Kaiser, and the question was up at that time as to whether or not unrestricted sub-



marine warfare should be resumed. The Secretary of State of Germany for Foreign Affairs was opposing the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare. Hindenburg and Ludendorff said that the intervention of America would not be of any importance in the war, and the German Secretary of State for the Navy in that conference, then or later said, "I consider the intervention of America to be worth nothing at all." The argument was advanced in that conference that America was not industrially mobilized.

That was the reason, according to this statement, that America's entrance into the World War would be of no effect whatever. Mr. Johnson goes on:

Finally the Chief of the German Naval Staff summarized what had been said by the others to the effect that it would be a long time before the different arms could be manufactured in America because of necessity of jigs, dies, and tools being manufactured. He summarized it all, saying after rising to his feet, and clicking his heels together, "I give Your Majesty my word as a Prussian officer that not a single American will land on the Continent."

That made a good story—

That is the way he concluded it, and the background of it was the lack of industrial organization in this country. The story as told that day was substantially true. I have an abiding belief, personally, that if we had been industrially mobilized as we are now seeking to be we would not have been dragged into that war.

The same old propaganda. If we had been industrially mobilized at the time of the World War we would not have been dragged into the war. What did William Jennings Bryan say on that subject? After he had resigned as Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan said in a speech in the neighborhood of Washington that the countries that were best armed were ones which always went into the war first. He said that in his opinion if the United States had been as well armed at the beginning of the World War as the big Army and Navy crowd wanted it to be the United States would have been in right from the start; and I think he was correct.

But Mr. Johnson says that if we had been industrially mobilized at the beginning of the World War we would not have gone into the war at all. What a wonderful story. Representative COLLINS said, "Mr. Secretary, where did you get that story?" Mr. Johnson could not quite remember where he got it. He is now out telling stories along the same line, and I do not suppose he can remember where he gets them, either, or who instructed him to put them out; but he is out peddling such stories to try to create sentiment for war at the present time, sentiment for the United States to go into the World War and mix up in Europe.

Mr. President, we had no business whatever in the World War or in Europe's entanglements.

I quote from a statement from the Iron Age entitled "44,500,000 Lost Man-Years":

War is perhaps the greatest of all destroyers of wealth, purchasing power, and jobs. It is doubly nonproductive in that it not only diverts effort from the creation of wealth, but in addition destroys it.

A large part of our unemployment in the United States is caused by the fact that we are now paying the cost of the World War.

When a person or a nation has good credit, it does not have to pay "on the nail" for what it buys. It can utilize the deferred-payment plan.

The disadvantage of the deferred-payment plan is that the interest is likely to eat you up.

When America entered the World War its credit was excellent. Our national debt was only \$3,000,000,000. Today our national debt is \$40,000,000,000. It will soon be \$45,000,000,000, perhaps \$50,000,000,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That statement is in error to this extent, that according to the Treasury statement, which I received this morning—I sent down there to obtain it—the national debt of the United States at the time we entered the war amounted to only \$1,240,000,000.

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not understand that statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understood the statement the Senator was reading, it was to the effect that when we entered the war our national debt was \$3,000,000,000. As a matter of fact, according to the Treasury figures it was only \$1,240,000,000.

Mr. FRAZIER. I thank the Senator for that correction. Whoever wrote the editorial in the Iron Age did not put the

war debt high enough either, in my opinion. He says it will be \$45,000,000,000, or perhaps \$50,000,000,000.

The cost of the World War to the United States, according to a report made by the Secretary of the Treasury in 1934, was \$42,000,000,000. Add to that the appropriations made in the peacetime years since for the Army and Navy, namely, eleven and one-half billions. The sum total is fifty-three and one-half billions.

Of course, that sum is not anywhere near large enough, Mr. President; and the expense of the World War will keep on for some time. It will not be paid for some time. It will keep growing larger. I think it was Mr. Coolidge who was quoted here yesterday to the effect that before it was paid it would be at least \$100,000,000,000. I think that estimate is probably correct. But this editorial writer puts the figure at fifty-three and a half billion dollars as the cost of the World War to the United States, including the money that has been spent for increased armaments since the World War. He says:

Isn't it significant that the entire great debt of the United States of today can be accounted for by the cost to us of the World War and the cost of preparedness since then?

Yes. The debt of the United States today can be accounted for by the expense of the World War; there can be no question about that.

Nature always exacts a balance. When we destroy purchasing power by diverting production from profitable and proper channels to the destructive uses of war we are accumulating debts that will be paid in unemployment.

Let us take, for example, the \$53,500,000,000 cost to us of the World War and subsequent armament cost and see what it means in terms of jobs. At an average total annual wage of \$1,200, this sum represents 44,500,000 man-years of work.

Forty-four and a half million man-years of work!

We have been paying back this war debt in idleness and unemployment—with interest.

Diversion of effort from production to destruction—overstimulation of industry and overexpansion of capacity to meet the needs of Mars; artificial and temporary increase in purchasing power through induction into industry of women and others previously not gainfully employed—a short and merry decade of inflation and speculation—and then the awakening. That is war.

Let us keep this in mind in facing the present European conflagration: Machines cannot produce wealth as fast as war can destroy it.

Let us keep in mind when we face the present European conflagration that "machines cannot produce wealth as fast as war can destroy it."

These figures are amazing—and yet they are undoubtedly too conservative.

Our loss in manpower—of 130,000 killed, and thousands that died of diseases in Army camps, and thousands more that were hopelessly maimed and crippled, and more thousands who lost their reason and are in insane asylums—should also be taken into account, and the cost of the depression, and loss in unemployment, business, and agriculture, should be included.

All in all, our participation in the World War was an extremely expensive orgy. Whether we were dragged in—and it is admitted that we were dragged in—by false propaganda by England and France or false propaganda at home, or however we got in, it was exceedingly expensive; and the end is not yet. We are continuing to pay; our children will continue to pay, and children yet unborn will continue to pay, the debts of the last World War of 25 years ago. Now we are asked to lift the embargo on arms, which undoubtedly is a step toward leading us into the war now raging; and if we should get into that war, the expenses will grow vastly greater.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President—

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. Is it not also a fact that before the World War we were told of the great prosperity war business would bring us?

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes; there was a great boom on, and some profits were made during the World War. As I remember the figures, several hundred new millionaires were made during the World War. That was real blood money.

We have heard some people talk about the farmers getting rich out of the World War, but that is a mistake. I come from a wheat-producing section. A minimum price for

wheat was kindly fixed by the Congress. Then, I think, Mr. Hoover, the former President, who was then food administrator declared it to be a maximum price, and it stayed a maximum price, while the cost of production, labor charges, and the cost of living all went up, so that the farmer could not make anything even at the high price he got for his wheat. That price would have gone a great deal higher had it not been for the maximum price which was really fixed. The producers of some other commodities such as cotton did obtain an immense profit, but there followed a depression which more than offset any gain that was made during the wartimes by the farmers and by the manufacturers and by others, except perhaps, a few selfish profiteers who made enormous profits, blood money, during the wartime.

We have heard about the industrial-mobilization plan and limiting profits, and so forth. War profits cannot be limited too greatly to suit me. I am hopeful that they can be limited so that in the event of another war the munitions manufacturers and others who make money in selling materials to warring nations will not make more money than the soldiers, the boys who are drafted to go into the war.

Mr. President, I pray to God that our country will never engage in another foreign war.

Mr. LUNDEEN obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from West Virginia for that purpose?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Under the circumstances, I prefer not to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

#### OUR PERMANENT FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, this is certainly stormy weather in foreign affairs. The ship of state can hardly be said to ride at anchor, nor do many of us feel that it is being safely guided through this period of storm and stress. At such a time it is well to consult our chart and compass in order to make sure of our course. I know of no better star to follow than the faith of the fathers and founders of America. The very north star of our foreign affairs is, and should forever remain, the Farewell Address of George Washington, of whom Lincoln once said:

Washington is the mightiest name of earth—long since mightiest in the cause of civil liberty—still mightiest in moral reformation. On that name no eulogy is expected. It cannot be. To add brightness to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name, and in its naked deathless splendor leave it shining on.

Had we in these later days followed his inspired advice, America would today be a happier and a more prosperous land. So I ask the Senate to listen to the words of Washington.

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Nothing is more essential than that permanent inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another a habitual hatred, or a habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill-will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or

justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils? Such an attachment of a small or weak, toward a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it.

At that point, Mr. President, I commend these words to the distinguished and able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], who was quoted in the press as saying that he disliked a certain foreign country, and he disliked another foreign country, and he disliked a third foreign country. One edition of the newspaper used the word "hate," which seems later to have been changed to "dislike," but which is not very much in accordance with the advice and warnings of the Father of his Country:

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith.—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.

Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest.

Constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity toward other nations.



So speaks Washington to all Americans of all the future. But lest there be fellow citizens who will not listen to Washington—and I am afraid there are some citizens who do not listen to Washington—let us turn to the pages of Jefferson, the author of our Declaration of Independence. Let us examine the statements on foreign affairs of Andrew Jackson and of Henry Clay and every worth-while statesman who ever lived under the American flag, and we shall find there one great chorus against entanglements in the quarrels of Europe, against American soldiers fighting to settle such quarrels, against the insidious influence and intrigues of the Old World, and the propaganda which comes to America from Europe to drag us into their struggles. The time has arrived to be American, wholly American, and nothing but American.

#### FEBRUARY 22—WASHINGTON'S ANNIVERSARY

But we persist in reading the Farewell Address on February 22, going through the motions of it, but giving it no heed. I am talking now about the foreign policy pursued by this country during the past 25 years. I remember that in the House of Representatives, where we have the likeness of the first President of our country beside the Speaker's desk, I pointed to that great portrait, and those who stood about me said, "Oh, he has been dead 120 years." But even though dead 120 years, he visioned the future—he had more wisdom and vision than all the small potatoes and nubbins and two-by-fours we have had running the State Department and the foreign affairs of this country in the past 25 years.

#### JEFFERSON BANQUETS

Banquets are given annually in honor of Thomas Jefferson; but if he were here now, I venture to assert that he would not care much about those banquets. Thomas Jefferson once said that "for us to attempt to reform Europe by war would prove us only to be maniacs." Just what is the policy of the Jeffersonian party in that respect today? They have departed from the policies of Jefferson. They do not read Jefferson any more. They give banquets in honor of Jefferson, and they come here and hold high office, but Jefferson himself is forgotten.

#### ANDREW JACKSON CELEBRATION

Since Jefferson has been dead so many years, however, we might turn to the pages of Andrew Jackson, who, by the way, collected the French war debt in his day. Perhaps if we had an Andrew Jackson now we might collect another French war debt. Banquets are given in honor of Andrew Jackson, but I do not hear of anything being said at those banquets about his collection of the French debt. The great Tennessean whose lofty patriotism no man can question collected that French war debt a hundred and more years ago. Why not read his words and follow his example? Why be so tender about the British and the French? Why not make them toe the mark? They have the territory, they have the wealth and resources to pay; and I propose to show, with the permission of this great Senate, that they can pay, and can pay now.

#### JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, OLD MAN ELOQUENT

Some day, with the indulgence of the Senate, I shall read a chapter from a very able book written by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], a chapter concerning John Quincy Adams—Old Man Eloquent—and the debate which occurred upon the question of collecting the French war debts, when there were people abroad in the land who said, "How are you going to collect them? Are you going to send the sheriff to get them, or draw a sight draft? Which policy are you going to pursue?" But Jackson made the statement, in his declaration to Congress, that if the debt were not paid he would seize gold and silver and securities of French nationals in our financial institutions, and their other property and possessions in America. There was a red-blooded American. It might do the administration some good to read Jackson a little bit more than they are doing. They are honoring that great President with banquets. They might read and study his state papers with much profit.

With the permission of the Senate, I should like to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a telegram from the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, signed by its president, reaffirming

the stand of the great labor movement of Minnesota against war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., September 27, 1939.

HON. ERNEST LUNDEEN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Be it resolved, That we, the Minnesota State Federation of Labor reaffirm the stand of the labor movement against war; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand the adoption of a constitutional amendment that would take the war-making power out of the hands of Congress and refer it to a vote of the people.

R. A. OLSON, President.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, no wonder labor is losing confidence in our war-making powers. We shout peace, peace; keep out of war, keep out of war, and then immediately proceed to plunge into war. We break the most solemn pledges to our voters, and betray their confidence—that we did on April 6, 1917, and all history now pronounces that war a colossal blunder.

There has come to my notice an address by Gen. Smedley D. Butler, commander of the marines in France during the World War. I do not know how popular he is around the Capitol any longer. He was quite a general during the World War, and has been addressing the American people about keeping out of the quarrels of Europe ever since. This calls to my mind the commander in chief of the American Navy during the World War, Admiral Sims. I do not think we are heeding his statement concerning battleships and dreadnaughts. He said that the safest place for battleships and dreadnaughts in the next war would be as far up the Mississippi River as we could get them. I might read the statements of Brig. Gen. William Mitchell on that subject also. And just now I see newspaper headlines that great ships—battleships—are being sunk by a few inexpensive planes. What will our dreadnaught advocates say now about their huge super-navies? Better listen to Admiral Sims and Billy Mitchell.

In view of these things, I voted not only for the appropriation for 5,500 airplanes, but I voted for the 6,000. I voted for the greatest number offered to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I have the honor to be a member, or presented to the Senate on the floor of the Senate.

This article containing the interview with General Butler, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer a few days ago, reads:

ARMS CREDITS SURE PATH TO WAR, SAYS GENERAL BUTLER—SELL THEM NOTHING WITHOUT CASH, OR DEMOCRACY WILL BE LOST ON A FOREIGN BATTLEGROUND, HE WARNS

(By Smedley D. Butler, major general, United States Marine Corps, retired. Holder of two Congressional Medals of Honor for valor in the field. Outspoken advocate of American isolation from foreign "power politics." Home: Newtown Square, Pa.)

The American people are about to buy another international gold brick.

Their last purchase of that commodity had tragic consequences—125,000 dead, 234,300 wounded, 4,500 missing, and \$41,765,000,000 cost, as I recall the figures offhand. If this one goes through, it may be the finish of everything we hold dear. We may lose our children, our wealth, and, above all else, our democracy, which every one of us loves. At the minute war is declared, America becomes a dictatorship. No living man knows whether that dictator, whoever he may be, won't like the job so well he'll want to hang on to it.

#### FIFTY-FIFTY CHANCE

One of the lessons we thought we learned from the last war was that one bar against getting into the next one would be refusal to sell our goods on credit; another was not to permit American ships to carry contraband materials to warring nations through belligerent zones.

Personally, I am opposed to selling any of the belligerents anything—even toothpicks, for toothpicks are merely cellulose in splinter form. That, in my opinion, is the best way to keep us out of war. If we sell goods to the belligerents it's a 9-to-1 shot we'll be in the war before it's over. If we don't, we have better than a 50-50 chance to stay out of it.

Money obtained from selling war materials is blood money, and no lasting good can come of it. It is cowardly for us to say to a belligerent, "Here, you take this bomb and toss it—I'm afraid." If the American people hate Hitler and want him destroyed, they ought to get in it right away and bear their fair share of the job. Otherwise, it's none of their business.

#### IT'S POLITICS NOW

But I believe that next to that kind of neutrality, the overwhelming majority of the American people stand pat on cash and carry as against credit and carry.

With a little hocus-pocus, but without warning, and while war is in progress, the majority leadership of the United States Senate scraps the cash and substitutes credit.

They haven't done it from impure motives. They haven't done it because there is some sort of a clique in our own Government trying to swing our Nation into the war on the side of the Allies. That's bunk.

But I do believe that enactment of the credit clause will do more than anything else to draw us into war.

It amounts to the same thing, in my opinion, as calling up the first American class of conscripts. As sure as death and taxes, it is the back door into eventual American participation in the high-pressure international politics being played in Europe right now. Before the first gun was fired, it was "diplomacy"; but now that they're shooting, it's politics.

#### WHAT WAR MEANS

What does war for America mean? It means hundreds of thousands of our young men killed and maimed. It means hundreds of thousands of survivors ruined for the only job we have any right to require of them—that of building a stronger American democracy. It means millions of heartbroken mothers and wives and sweethearts. It means new hospitals for new war victims, though we haven't finished building or paying for hospitals to take care of the last war's victims. It means new debts and new deficits. It means, inevitably, national bankruptcy.

Why substitute credit for cash?

We all know what cash and carry means. It is evident that even those supporting credit and carry disagree among themselves what that program means or may mean.

You go to your grocer. You plump down money for a dozen eggs. If, on the way home, you drop them, it isn't your grocer's fault. They were your eggs. Substitute guns or airplanes or cotton or beef or wheat for that dozen eggs, and any of the belligerents for yourself, and you have cash and carry. It's simple. It's uncomplicated. It's foolproof.

#### ALL WE'LL GET IS A PROMISE

Full title to whatever goods he has purchased and paid for, on the line, passes to the purchaser at the dock. What happens to it after that, by every rule of international law, good conscience, and ordinary horse sense, is his worry.

If we're going to sell anything to anybody for war purposes, that's the way to sell it.

Incidentally, in the last few days, at least two very wealthy American businessmen, who individually and as heads of corporations stood to gain most by selling war materials, came out flat-footed for a complete embargo. They were big enough to oppose that kind of profit. They are Americans, thank God, before they are merchants.

I might say in that connection that one of these men, I believe, was the president of the United States Steel Corporation, who admitted that while profits would come to his great corporation, greater than if we stayed out, yet in the long run the losses would be greater than any profit that would accrue if we entered the European war.

What is credit and carry?

It means that hundreds of corporations in belligerent countries are going to bombard us for war materials. They will plump something down on Uncle Sam's counter—but it won't be cash. Oh, no. It will be a promise to pay in 90 days, backed by the credit, if any, of the particular belligerent's government.

Or, I might say, the word of that government. I understand now that certain nations are questioning the word of Hitler. They say his word is not of any value. Perhaps it is not. But before I get through here today, if I am permitted, I will try to ascertain whether the word of the French and the British is of any value. Perhaps they are all in the same basket.

#### MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON SCRUPULOUS HONESTY

Mr. Chamberlain is reported to have said in substance that one of the things for which Great Britain is fighting in this war is that henceforth, when the word of governments is given, it shall be scrupulously observed. He was referring, of course, to Hitler's promises and engagements. I commend Mr. Chamberlain's own words to him in connection with the dishonored debt of his Government to the United States. That debt, greatly cut down from the original amount, was the subject of long conference between a British mission and an American commission; and the settlement, when reached, was ratified by the British Parliament and the American Congress. Under Mr. Chamberlain's own doctrine, should not such an obligation be scrupulously observed?

But it was not observed. The British apparently are a law unto themselves and by some divine right they think they are permitted to determine when they care to scrupulously observe their engagements.

#### WILL GOOD MONEY GO AFTER BAD?

Granting original complete good faith on the part of the purchaser, suppose at the end of 90 days a request is made on us for an extension or a refinancing of the credit. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to try to salvage what we have invested? Or are we going to toss good money after bad? Or are we going to be presented with some smart argument for new credits and new notes?

Mr. President, we loaned the Germans quite a large sum of money after the World War with which to carry on the governments of their cities and other activities within Germany. First we were going to shoot them off the earth and then, after we got through with them, we made up our minds we were going to finance them, so we loaned them money. Then after awhile we thought we would like to get some interest on the money, so we asked the Germans for interest. What did they reply? They said, "Well, if you will lend us some more money, we will pay interest on the money you have already loaned us."

#### THE ANSWER OF EUROPE, "WE WILL NOT PAY AN HONEST DEBT"

And that was the answer of all European governments: "If you will loan us some more money, we will pay you a little interest on the money you have already loaned us." "But not quite as much as you loaned us," they might have added.

Whatever happens, it is as plain as a pike staff that the United States of America will be financing one group of belligerents against another group in a war.

A banker has obligations. Even though the Government of the United States, as such, doesn't extend one penny of credit, it is ex officio chairman of the board for every corporation that does. All the laws ever written won't prevent those corporations, exactly like stockholders in a bank, from demanding that the chairman use pressure to insure the loans. You don't even have to impute greed or lust or inhumanity to the sellers of war materials. It's just human nature.

#### ALLIES STILL OWE UNITED STATES \$12,000,000,000

I wish to say in that connection that that is \$12,000,000,000 after you have pared it down and after you have refunded it down to \$12,000,000,000.

Mr. BORAH. After we had settled some of it for 28 cents on the dollar.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The distinguished and able Senator from Idaho says, "After we had pared some of it down to 28 cents on the dollar" with a promise that they, of course, would pay. But their word to pay the 28 cents on the dollar was no better and no more valid than their word to pay the 100 cents on the dollar. It was no more valid than any word of Chancellor Hitler's or any other European statesman, and yet these nations go about the earth and question the word of other nations. Holier than thou; oh, yes; scrupulously honest. Just how good is their word? I do not believe any of these foreign diplomats. Sometimes because of the way they conduct our foreign affairs I feel like giving our own diplomats a slightly different pronunciation—"diplomuts." At the expense of the American people, at the expense of the American taxpayers, these debts are now resting on the backs of the American people. They are bending under these burdens. We have voted bonds to bring victory to these nations. They promised us they would pay. They have world empires such as the world never saw before.

#### THE GREAT BRITISH AND FRENCH EMPIRES

There are no empires in the world as great as the French and British Empires. The French Empire alone is more than 1,000,000 square miles greater than the United States. I shall give the Senate exact figures before I am through. The British Empire is four and a half times as large as our great country. They cannot pay their debts, but they are willing to spend money to keep what they have. They are for peace as long as they can get the pieces, and then after that they are for war to get more.

Just the other day I inserted in the Record a statement showing that the British have fought 54 wars, the French 53 wars, in the last 150 years. I am now having compiled a list of the wars in which the German people have been engaged, and I will match the records, if I have the opportunity a little later on, and we shall see that there have been plenty of wars on both sides. These wars will continue for a



thousand years into the future, as they run back a thousand years in the past.

#### SHALL WE CONTINUE TO FINANCE THEIR WARS?

The question now is, Are we going to be plunged into them; are we going to die on their battlefields; and are we going to finance their wars even after the wars are over?

I may be pardoned, therefore, Mr. President, for reading something from the fighting general, who I think has trimmed down his language a little for the newspapers, because I have heard him on two or three occasions when his language would almost burn fire. But no one can question his Americanism; no one can question that he is for America first, now and all the time, and that he is American through and through.

I continue to read:

The answer: "Require cash, 90 percent; give credit, 10 percent."

That follows the paragraph which reads:

The American people aren't fooling themselves. They believe, heart and soul, in real neutrality and keeping their hands off this mess. Short of that, if we must sell, they're for cash and carry 10 to 1. The latest Gallup poll asked this question: "If the neutrality law is changed, should England and France be required to pay cash for goods, or should we give them credit if they cannot pay?"

Mr. President, I wish some Senator would rise some day and elucidate a little bit about the Gallup poll. This man may have the name of "Gallup," but I have never heard him galloping around getting anyone's opinions about anything. I do not believe he has a true cross-section of American opinion. If I am wrong, I wish to be corrected. Anyone can sit down at a desk and guess right once in a while. I should like a little further information on the Gallup poll from some Senator.

I continue to read from General Butler's statement:

The answer: "Require cash, 90 percent; give credit, 10 percent."

#### STATESMEN WON'T SHOULDER RIFLES

That's plain enough. Only one out of every ten Americans wants any part in acting as banker for this new crop of European poker players.

In the face of that attitude, by what possible right, by what strange conception of their duty, have Senator PITTMAN and his adherents inserted the credit clause in the new neutrality bill?

I presume as a distinguished citizen of this country the general has the right to ask that question.

I assert, with all respect, that this group are welching on their unmistakable duty to the American people.

No one wants America to participate in this war. No one even tolerates the thought. But Senator PITTMAN won't have to carry a rifle. He won't have to live in a lousy, rat-infested trench. He won't have to inhale the odors of a stinking battlefield.

#### SENATORS WON'T EAT CHOW RATIONS

He and his followers won't have to eat iron rations and submit their bodies to the torture of shot and shrapnel and bomb and bayonet.

That, Mr. President, is more like the general. That is the way he usually speaks.

They might not even live to face the awful task of reconstructing a demobilized post-war America from its physical, social, industrial, and economic chaos.

It is my firm conviction that no man has the right to move the United States 1 inch toward even the possibility of war unless he is prepared to make a blood sacrifice, unless he is prepared to take his dearest relative by the hand, march him to the nearest recruiting station, and say, "Here, take him."

It's up to Congress and the national administration, which now has a real mandate from the people, to scrap this credit business and get back, at least, to the fundamental cash-and-carry plan before debate, that may prove ruinous, begins on the whole issue. For my part, I repeat: Sell them nothing.

These are the words of Gen. Smedley Butler, chief of the marines in the World War, eminent citizen, and patriotic American.

#### THE BILLIONS EUROPE OWES US

Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune of October 7, 1939, has a cartoon on the front page, picturing the main entrance to the Capitol, and there is a sign hanging there, "Debate on arms sale," and on the steps outside the door is a huge package pictured as a traveler, and the title is, "The Billions Europe Owes Us"; and around about the feet of this figure and his traveling bag are bricks that have

been thrown at him. "Uncle Shylock" is one; "War profiteers" is another; and "Blood money" is another. And he is named, "The Forgotten Man." The forgotten man is the billions Europe owes us.

#### FINLAND PAYS ITS DEBTS

In this connection we must never forget the sterling honesty and national uprightness of the Finnish people—an honest nation that pays its debt to America.

Great Britain, on June 4, 1934, endeavored to give us some excuses, and I want to place them in the RECORD. I think we should always look at both sides of any question.

The British note of June 4, 1934, says:

Nothing that has happened since [December 1, 1932]—

Evidently the date of another statement—

Nothing that has since [December 1, 1932] occurred has led His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to change the views they then expressed.

But, unfortunately, recent events have shown that discussions on the whole question with a view to a final settlement cannot at present usefully be renewed. In these circumstances His Majesty's Government would have been quite prepared to make a further payment of the debt and without prejudice to their right again to present the case of its readjustment, on the assumption that they would again have received the President's declaration that he would not consider them in default. They understand, however, that in consequence of recent legislation no such declaration would now be possible, and if this be the case the procedure adopted by common agreement in 1933 is no longer practicable.

But they wish to reiterate that, while suspending further payments until it becomes possible to discuss an ultimate settlement of intergovernmental war debts with a reasonable prospect of agreement, they have no intention of repudiating their obligations, and will be prepared to enter upon further discussion of the subject at any time when in the opinion of the President such discussion would be likely to produce results of value.

Senators hear again that the British speak of readjustment after the revision of the debt had been accomplished. It does not make any difference how many times you revise, they want more adjustments, readjustment and readjustment.

#### SEIZE THE WEST INDIES

I think that one way of bringing them to their senses on this question would be to point out to the British and the French the West Indies, and serve notice upon them that unless they pay within a certain period we will send the armed forces of America there to seize them, in accordance with the Jacksonian theory, expounded in the days of good, strong, red-blooded, affirmative democracy and democratic principles.

#### THE WEST INDIES CAN BE ACQUIRED WITHOUT WAR

People in those days said there would be war. The question was asked, "You would not have war, would you?" If such a thing were done, not a shot would be fired. They are pretty busy on the western front, at the west wall, the Siegfried line, and the Maginot line. They are pretty busy in the Old World. They are not going to bother us over here. Mighty America must rise to its position of defending its own rights here in the Western Hemisphere. The islands to which I refer are American islands. They should be American bases for our naval craft and aircraft. We should have them in our possession. The American flag should fly over them in the West Indies skies; and we should be there now fortifying them, as we are fortifying Puerto Rico. I was for fortifying Puerto Rico.

#### I HAVE VOTED FOR AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE

With my vote I have sustained the American Army in the Hawaiian Islands and in Puerto Rico, and wherever we have sought to make strong the defense of America from a military or aviation standpoint. I supported every appropriation we have made for naval defense until the admirals gave notice that we had a sufficient Navy to defend the Monroe Doctrine. Then suddenly, within a week, we were confronted with a request for another billion or more. The cost will be nearly \$2,000,000,000 when we consider the increased prices we shall have to pay.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Gladly.

Mr. DANAHER. Has not the Senator heard various Senators in the past week explain that their individual position

on the pending question is being taken because of their desire to render assistance to Great Britain and France in the struggle overseas?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator another question, if I may.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. If we were to face frankly and directly and honestly in the United States Senate the question of how far and upon what basis we should extend possible help to Great Britain and France, might it not appear that as a condition precedent to our extending any such assistance we should ask Great Britain and France to cede to the United States in advance such island possessions, which, if we did not have them in advance, might possibly go to an enemy in the event Great Britain and France should lose the war? Let me put it to the Senator in another form of question, if I may. If our diplomacy should move as Great Britain's diplomacy has moved in the past, at the very least we would remove the territories and islands which are necessary to our defense from the possibility of an ultimate peace putting such islands in the hands of an enemy. Would it not seem to the Senator that we could very properly at the very least take such steps for our own protection?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I believe the Senator has stated an inquiry which might give us some thought along those lines. I believe we could proceed as the Senator has suggested, making our position emphatic, however, instead of sending a lot of scented and perfumed notes over there, to which nobody pays any attention, with little sidenotes of friendship and love for those nations.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DANAHER. It seems to me that some such discussion is appropriate to the very splendid trend of the Senator's observations, in the light of the fact that the pending bill contains section 7b. I direct the Senator's attention to the point that section 7b says that—

The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

In the light of the Senator's observations, and in connection with the possibility of our diplomacy acting for our own protection, it would seem to me that the point could be developed.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

#### GIVING MORE LAND TO THE BRITISH

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the able Senator, and in reply I call attention to a clipping which I hold in my hand. Not only are we not asking for the West Indies islands, but I have here a clipping from the Denver Post headed: Claims to Little America may be given up to the British. We are contemplating giving them something more. They already have 12,250,000 square miles or more of the earth's surface. That is not enough. We intend to give them some more. We probably intend to run the figure up to 13,000,000 square miles. It is too bad to leave it at 12,250,000. We probably ought to make it an even 13,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Particularly in connection with the subject of our explorations in the north and in the south, I might add that doubtless the Senator is already familiar with the fact that Admiral Byrd is now engaged in equipping two or three ships for an expedition to the south for the purpose of laying definite claim to previous discoveries. Those who have familiarized themselves with the subject, and have followed the equipment of this expedition, are of the high hope that our acquisitions by way of discovery may be definitely located and ascertained.

Since the Senator has been good enough to yield to me, I wish to make the observation that we are now engaged in fortifying and refortifying, by way of strengthening, our island possessions in the Caribbean, and in connection there-

with we are about to let contracts for the strengthening of our fortifications and for the development of docks and facilities at San Juan, Puerto Rico. I am informed that these contracts, involving the expenditure of millions upon millions of dollars in our national-defense program, will be let between now and November 1, according to information I received from one of the admirals yesterday when I visited the Navy Department for the purpose of obtaining direct information in regard to the building program.

We are about to make expenditures in strengthening our fortifications in the Caribbean, particularly at San Juan. In view of that fact it might be a very good time to remind our friends across the seas, in whom we are so vitally interested, that as part payment of the thirteen or fourteen billion dollars they now owe us, represented by principal and interest, they should convey to us some of these islands. I am particularly interested in the island of Bermuda, which, by the way, is just off the coast of North Carolina, my great Commonwealth, a distance of only about 500 miles directly east.

The Senator will recall that in the West Indies, in the Caribbean, the British have half a dozen or more islands which are in immediate proximity to our Virgin Islands, which we bought in 1919 for about \$25,000,000. They might consider letting us have Bermuda. I am particularly interested in Bermuda becoming an American possession for the reason that 95 percent of all the revenue derived by the port of Hamilton, the capital of Bermuda, comes out of the port of New York; and if we should become possessed of Bermuda, the revenue which is now going to our British brothers could be kept within the till of the taxpayers of the United States.

Let me add further that the little island of Bimini is not far from Miami, Fla. In fact, it is not more than an hour's flying time by airplane from Florida. Then there is Nassau. Those islands are just a stone's throw off the coast of continental United States.

The British are most friendly to us. They are very nice in all respects, and I know that they want to do the right thing. Perhaps if we should mention to them the possibility of liquidating a portion of their obligation by transferring to us Bermuda, Nassau, and Bimini, the suggestion might be productive of results. By the way, since we are fortifying our possessions in the Caribbean, I might suggest at this time that it would not be at all out of order to suggest to the British in a very friendly manner that we might be interested in taking over Trinidad, of which Port-of-Spain is the capital.

Mr. LUNDEEN. May I interrupt the Senator there to say that that would not be helping the British, would it? Unless we helped with money, they would not consider the help of any value.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It would be helping them in the sense of giving them an opportunity to demonstrate that they are sufficiently honest to pay debts which heretofore they have not attempted to liquidate.

The position of the Port-of-Spain is very important. I make mention of that for the reason, as I stated a moment ago, we are fortifying our possessions in the Caribbean. While on that subject, if the Senator will pardon me, I wish to add that we might suggest to them that we would be interested in having them make arrangements for conveying to us at least a part and portion of some of their territories in the north Atlantic. There is Labrador and there is Newfoundland. In connection with the trans-Atlantic flying service which has been inaugurated by the Pan-American organization, I have been informed that some of their great flying ships make landings at Newfoundland. I know when I was in Newfoundland last year there was being prepared what I was told was to be one of the largest and finest airports in the world. We could use those English possessions which are very near us. So I think, as a matter of fact, that this is the proper time to speak to our brothers across the sea and ascertain if they would not like to take advantage of "bargain day," for this is to them "bargain day." They say they need great sums of money and all that sort of thing. Of course, we would not give them any money, because they got about all



we had, but let us favor them in the way I have suggested. I want to help Great Britain; I want to help France by being of assistance to them in paying their debts. Here we have an opportunity to help them. I have heard a great deal about going to the aid of our brothers across the sea.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator will pardon me further, let me say that I join others in saying that now we ought to help Great Britain and France. I am in sympathy with and always like the fellow who is hard up; I want to help the man who owes a lot of money and cannot pay anybody. I have been in the same condition myself. I am always grateful to those friends of mine who do not press me for my debts; and I know that Great Britain is grateful and appreciative to us because we have not been nagging at her all the time, as we knew that some time she was going to pay. I believe now that she would appreciate it if we would provide for her the opportunity to liquidate her obligation to us. So let us help Great Britain and France. Let us say to Great Britain, for instance, that "We know you owe us a lot of money; we have not bothered you about it; but just turn over to us Trinidad and Bermuda and a portion of Labrador for airplane-landing purposes and naval bases and make arrangements to transfer a portion of Newfoundland, and, if you want to, you can throw in Jamaica for good measure."

In addition to that, so long as I am on this subject, speaking of British interests—

#### THE BRITISH ASK FOR AID

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, before the Senator continues on that point—and I wish to hear his further remarks—let me say that I do not believe the British understand the words "bargain day." They understand only the words "give me day."

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator means "gimme day."

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes; "gimme day"; they do not understand "bargain day."

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. REYNOLDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have been very greatly interested in the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who has expressed such a fervent wish to help Great Britain. He failed to urge another suggestion which would help them much more, namely, an arrangement with respect to Canada.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator for his contribution to "our" remarks; and, if the Senator from Minnesota will permit me further, since the Senator from Kentucky has mentioned Canada, I was about to say that, in my opinion, in relation to adequate national defense in which the people, particularly of California—and I address myself to the able junior Senator from that State [Mr. DOWNEY]—are so deeply interested, the construction of five highways to serve as military means of transportation as well as civilian is something to which we should give a great deal of attention and thought. I think eventually super-auto-highways will be constructed from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to Mexico. As a matter of fact, I know that our great President is interested in that, as are a great many members of this body. I happened to have an opportunity to talk to the President one day incidentally when I was at the White House with one of our colleagues. He, like a great many others, is interested in that feature of national defense.

For a number of years we have been interested in the development of a Pan-American highway that will eventually, I hope, lead from Juneau, the capital of Alaska, southward toward British Columbia, across continental United States into Mexico, from there west of the Yucatan country, to Guatemala City, the capital of Guatemala, then farther through the Central American countries, perhaps, of Costa Rica and Salvador, and on down to the Panama Canal. We

have spent a good deal of money on that enterprise, but one thing that is holding us up in reference to the development of the northern portion of that highway is that we have not as yet been able to make satisfactory arrangements to the extent of building a highway from Juneau southward, we will say, to Vancouver and British Columbia and then farther southward to our great Northwest—and I have in mind the lovely city of Seattle.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Let not the Senator forget Minneapolis.

Mr. REYNOLDS. If England wants to liquidate her obligations—and I know that she wants to, because nobody would say England is dishonest—she might arrange with the Canadian Government, as suggested by the able junior Senator from the great State of Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], to convey to us a strip of land from Seattle through Vancouver and British Columbia northward to the Alaskan line, say, 50 or 100 miles wide. Then we could go ahead in earnest and with enthusiasm with the construction of the great Pan-American highway.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much, and I apologize to him for having consumed so much of the time when he was interesting the Members of this body. However, before sitting down, I trust that the Senator will permit me further merely to ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which I clipped from the Liberty magazine of the issue of October 21, 1939, entitled "Stay Out, America," these being observations made by former war correspondents, and the article being subtitled:

Shall we fight again? A grim word from some who know what it would mean.

The article is written by a war correspondent who served in Europe during the World War.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed as requested.

#### COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from North Carolina for his statement concerning the policy we should pursue. Since the Canadian nation has been mentioned, I wish to recur to the words we heard over the radio last night by Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, in which he discussed that very question. He said:

This Western Hemisphere is our domain. It is our right to trade freely within it. From Alaska to Labrador, from the Hawaiian Islands to Bermuda, from Canada to South America, we must allow no invading army to set foot. These are the outposts of the United States. They form the essential outline of our geographical defense. We must be ready to wage war with all the resources of our Nation if they are ever seriously threatened. Their defense is the mission of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Corps—the minimum requirement of our military strength. Around these places should lie our line between neutrality and war. Let there be no compromise about our right to defend or trade within this area. If it is challenged by any nation, the answer must be war. Our policy of neutrality should have this as its foundation.

We must protect our sister American nations from foreign invasion, both for their welfare and our own. But, in turn, they have a duty to us. They should not place us in the position of having to defend them in America while they engage in wars abroad.

That may be something to think about—

Can we rightfully permit any country in America to give bases to foreign warships or to send its army abroad to fight while it remains secure in our protection at home?

We desire the utmost friendship with the people of Canada. If their country is ever attacked, our Navy will be defending their seas, our soldiers will fight on their battlefields, our fliers will die in their skies. But have they the right to draw this hemisphere into a European war simply because they prefer the Crown of England to American independence?

Returning now to the debt of France:

#### The debt of France

Liberty loans.....	\$2,997,477,800
Surplus commodities sold to.....	407,341,145

1922: Total debt without consideration of any interest.....	3,404,818,945
---	---------------

Source: Treasury—Annual Report, 1922.

These figures are somewhat interesting when we read about the deficits of our Government year after year and then consider the debt owed to this country by a nation that has more

than a million square miles more territory than we have, and also has unlimited wealth:

Balance due on principal after funding.....	\$3,863,650,000
Balance due on interest after funding.....	2,784,924,104

Total due.....	6,647,647,104
Total paid by France after funding.....	486,075,891
Total due the United States after funding as of Nov. 15, 1938.....	4,121,120,502

Source: Annual Report of Secretary of the Treasury, 1938, p. 548; 1931, p. 358. Brookings Institute, War Debts and Prosperity, pp. 439, 440. United States State Department, Press Releases of June 17, 1933.

(Compiled by Thomas R. Baldwin, June 27, 1939, Congressional Library.)

Statistics from: Combined Annual Reports of the World War Foreign Debt Commission. Memorandum on Indebtedness of Foreign Governments to the United States, by the Treasury Department, Jan. 31, 1938.

#### THE FRENCH EMPIRE

The French Empire has an area and a population as follows: The French Republic, 212,569 square miles; population, 42,000,000; possessions, 4,617,579 square miles. Our area is slightly over 3,000,000 square miles. Their possessions alone run a million and a half square miles larger than those of the United States. Population of French possessions, 70,000,000. Total area belonging to the French Empire—for that is what it is; it is an empire—4,830,148 square miles; total population, 122,000,000.

#### JUST HOW LARGE ARE THESE EMPIRES ANYWAY?

I never have been able to find out just exactly how large the French Empire is. I received these figures, and I pointed to a map hanging on my walls and said, "What about Clipper Island on the west coast of the Americas? You have not included that." The first figures that I received from very competent sources about the British Empire were that its area was twelve and a half million square miles; but after I had enumerated certain possessions that I was somewhat acquainted with after continued study—and I do not claim to have any exhaustive knowledge on the subject, certainly not the knowledge of Senators who went all through the refunding question years ago—we discovered an additional 750,000 square miles of the British Empire; so that the figures finally given are thirteen and a quarter million square miles, and that total does not include all of the South Polar region; and if we now turn over some of our claims to them, the total may well approach the figure of more than 13,000,000 square miles spoken of a little while ago.

#### THE GREAT RESOURCES OF FRANCE

The military expenditures of France in 1931 were \$460,122,000. In 1931 the debt payment was \$54,325,000. The military expenditures of France in 1939, at the present time, or a month or so ago, were \$12,000,000 per day. The total military expenditures for this year are estimated at \$4,380,000,000. That may not be the expenditure of a normal year, owing to the fact that the last half year, or nearly the last half year, is a war period for France. Nevertheless, France is finding the money.

I have here some excuses which the French put forward on December 3, 1932, asking for delay in payment:

The French Government cannot believe that in the last analysis the American people will consider their interests best served by the carrying out of an obligation, the strict application of which would result in creating further chaos and poverty throughout the world, inasmuch as the transfer of sums without corresponding exchange cannot but unbalance yet more profoundly international relations.

\* \* \* In urging the American Government to reexamine its request in the light of the foregoing the French Government believes that it is fulfilling not merely a national but an international duty. (New York Times, December 3, 1932, p. 12.)

#### HELPING THE BRITISH AND THE FRENCH

In other words, in 1932 the French Government wanted us to reexamine a question which was already closed. I should like some information from Senators of longer experience and greater ability than I, and who know the parliamentary situation and the financial abilities of various countries better than I do. When a nation owes us a principal debt of some eleven or twelve billion dollars, and interest over such a period that the total runs to, say, \$25,000,000,000, in round

numbers, and this figure is cut down to some \$12,000,000,000 by refunding, is it not a fact that if the refunding agreement is not kept, the original debt obtains? It seems to me that if the contract made by that Government during the refunding period is not kept, the original debt then is due. There may be an administration in power here some day which will insist on some American rights other than helping the British and French, which we hear so much about nowadays—noble sentiments like that.

#### FRENCH EMPIRE MAKES MANY AND LARGE LOANS

I have here some figures of loans France has made to other countries instead of paying her debt. The figures give the total loaned as of April 1932. I regret that I have not later figures. Just recently Great Britain loaned a large sum of money—some forty or fifty million dollars—to Poland. They have loaned large sums of money to Turkey. They are financing the earth; but I do not see any money coming to Uncle Sam from the roaring British lion, which has nearly one-third of the earth in its possession. The French loaned, as of April 1932, 13,277,000,000 francs. The source of that statement is the New York Times of April 14, 1932. It must be correct.

#### BUT THEY WILL NOT PAY AMERICA

Mr. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State in the Wilson administration, as reported in the New York Times, at the session of the Academy of Political Science held at the Hotel Astor in April 1932, when bankers were urging the revision of our war debts as an economic measure, made some remarks indicating that he was quite out of sympathy with the French argument for revision. I am rather astounded to hear that someone in this country is out of sympathy with the French.

The plea of France that she was unable to repay the money she borrowed from the United States—

He declared—

could not be expected to move us profoundly in the light of the tremendous loans made by France to foreign countries since the war, totaling 13,277,000,000 francs, exclusive of other large sums.

#### EUROPE HAS PLENTY OF MONEY FOR WAR

I have here an article from the Chicago Tribune concerning the cost of war and the moneys expended by various governments. I ask to have it included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 29, 1939]

#### COST OF WAR

Expenditures for war purposes in the table below are figured on the present rate of exchange. Neutral nations are listed because of their expenditures for protection.

Daily expenditures:	
Great Britain.....	\$21,000,000
France.....	12,000,000
Germany.....	12,000,000
Russia.....	4,000,000
Neutral nations.....	12,000,000

Yearly expenditures (Great Britain):

Last war:	
1914.....	\$4,000,000,000
1915.....	8,000,000,000
1916.....	10,000,000,000
1917.....	11,200,000,000
1918.....	8,000,000,000

This war:	
1937, preparation.....	\$4,000,000,000
1938, preparation.....	6,000,000,000
First fiscal year, estimated.....	8,000,000,000

National debt (Great Britain) 1914-39:

1914.....	\$2,600,000,000
1939.....	32,000,000,000

Mr. LUNDEEN. And, in that connection, please remember that Uncle Sam has financed John Bull so unselfishly that we now have a national debt more than \$10,000,000,000 larger than the national debt of the great world-conquering British Empire. On May 4, 1939, a French mission arrived in this country to pave the way for buying war materials. If I remember correctly, the able minority leader [Mr. McNARY] and the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] submitted a resolution concerning strategic war materials



that we might receive from Great Britain and France and that should be applied on the debt. Just what is wrong with that? We do not hear much about that put forward by the very able Senators here on the floor of the Senate, but we understand now that we have had some trade agreement with Great Britain concerning an exchange of our cotton for rubber, and so forth.

SOVIET UNION AND BRITAIN MAKE TRADE PACT

I am somewhat instructed—if I may use that word—by a news report which says that Russia, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain are engaging in a trade pact concerning rubber and wood pulp, and so forth, and Germany openly boasts that she is going to get the rubber from the Soviet Union. Perhaps that is only a boast. I think it is very well to take with a grain of salt anything emanating from any of the foreign governments. Certainly their word concerning the war debts and the payments they promised to make to the American Nation have not scaled 100 percent. These French missions come over here, and they go into the resources of America, and we are supposed to furnish them war material—I presume on credit—and it is not possible to get them to pay us the price of these war materials to apply on the debt.

I ask to have the statement on this subject included in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 4, 1939]

FRENCH MISSION ARRIVES TO PAVE WAY FOR BUYING WAR MATERIALS—  
WILL SURVEY AMERICAN INDUSTRIES AND INSTRUCT AS TO NEEDS—  
UNITED STATES NAVY RAISES ENLISTMENT TERM

(By J. Gilbert Norris)

A special French mission has arrived in this country to instruct American industry on French military needs and pave the way for large war orders in case trouble breaks out in Europe.

Announcement of its presence here was made by the War Department following a call made by the group upon Assistant Secretary of War Johnson. While the Department's announcement simply said it understood the delegation was here "with a view to the possible purchase of munitions," Lt. Col. Emmanuel Lombard, the French military attaché, said the mission would make a survey of American industry and then perhaps give some small orders to gear plants to produce large orders in wartime which will meet French Army specifications.

"The orders would be what your Army calls educational contracts under which the plants procure the necessary jigs and gages and dies which will enable them to produce large orders," he said, "no big contracts are contemplated as we could not afford them now."

Meanwhile, the administration's drive to complete American rearmament plans went forward at rapid tempo. With the signature of President Roosevelt, a supplemental defense appropriation bill became law, carrying funds for equipping an army of 400,000 with latest type weapons and equipment. The \$153,000,000 measure will permit the Army to buy or contract for the second increment of the emergency defense program—new tanks, semiautomatic rifles, artillery, and other equipment costing \$110,000,000.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. A few moments ago I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota quoted approvingly from the speech of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh. The other day there was put into the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] a speech of ex-President Hoover. In the speech delivered last night by Colonel Lindbergh, which was quoted by the Senator from Minnesota, Colonel Lindbergh suggests a four-point program.

In view of what the distinguished Senator has said, I should like to ask him whether he approves that program. The first point is, "an embargo on offensive weapons and munitions," with the emphasis on "offensive." The second is "the unrestricted sale of purely defensive armaments." In that respect Lindbergh and ex-President Hoover agree.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the Senator for calling that to my attention. Concerning the distinction between offensive and defensive weapons, I should be very much interested in any debate we have on the floor on that subject. So far as I am concerned, I think it would be very difficult to draw a line between the two.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to yield to our able leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would thoroughly agree with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. For instance, if some European nation, a belligerent, or all the belligerents, desired to purchase tanks in the United States, all the tanks being of the same kind, which ones would be offensive and which defensive? The same might be said of airplanes. If they are all of the same type, one to be used by one country and another by some other country, which is the offensive and which the defensive implement? Even if we take bombing planes, if a bombing plane bought and used by one nation seeks to destroy a munitions factory in an enemy nation so as to prevent the munitions and implements of war from ever getting out of the factory, and into the belligerent country, requiring it to defend itself against them, is that an offensive or a defensive operation? Many writers on military science have taken the position that the best defense is an offense, a movement to prevent an offender from invading one's country, or taking the offensive, or the initiative.

I can very well understand how difficult if not impossible it would be to decide what are offensive and what are defensive implements of war. I can agree thoroughly with the statement of the Senator on that subject.

Let us get closer home. Suppose I have been warned or have reason to believe that some fellow citizen of mine intends to murder me, and, in carrying out that objective, he goes to a hardware store and buys a .44 Colt pistol. Knowing about it, or having suspicion of it, and being unarmed, I go to the same hardware store and buy the same kind of an article, a .44 Colt, to defend myself. Which is the offensive and which is the defensive article? Of course, it all depends on the circumstances of the use. Laudable and idealistic as Mr. Herbert Hoover's suggestion is and as Colonel Lindbergh's suggestion is, I cannot to save my soul see how anyone can ever be wise enough and foresighted enough and discriminating enough to lay down a line of demarcation between what is offensive and what is defensive military equipment.

We know that a fort within a country to prevent invasion might be regarded as defensive. It might be said that anti-aircraft guns are defensive. Yet we know that anti-aircraft guns may be made mobile. They may be taken from one place to another, and they may be used in offensive warfare as well as in defensive warfare. So that even the illustration which was drawn, about an anti-aircraft gun being an example of a defensive implement which we might well sell to the belligerents it seems to me loses sight of the fact that even an anti-aircraft gun can be used for offensive warfare, as well as to bring down airships which are flying over one's home.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

DEFENSIVE AND OFFENSIVE WEAPONS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I thank the able leader for his statement. I appreciate the Senator from Wisconsin bringing this matter before the Senate. I have given it no deep study. I heard the statement broadcast by Colonel Lindbergh last night, but I hesitated at this point, and want to give it further study. So far as defensive weapons are concerned, such as Polish anti-aircraft guns, just where are they today? They are in Germany. I doubt very much whether a clear distinction can be drawn, and if some Senator can clear that point in my mind, I shall thoroughly appreciate it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think I can, Mr. President.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The Senator from Missouri was on his feet, and I yield to him first; and let me say that Colonel Lindbergh delivered a great American speech on foreign affairs during September of this year, and I consider the speech of the colonel last night another great contribution to the literature on foreign policy; but I must confess my honest doubts about drawing a definite line between offensive and defensive weapons. I seek further light on that subject and shall be glad to hear from Senators, and especially from my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from the great State of North Carolina.

I now yield first to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, while I think Colonel Lindbergh's speech last night was, without any question, one of the most magnificent statements not only on this question, but one of the finest statements I have ever read, from a great, patriotic American figure, with a clearness and a conviction and a logic which I do not think can be answered, I do agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said, that it is impossible to draw a distinction between weapons for offense and weapons for defense. Ordinarily, as has been said, we think of an antiaircraft gun as being a defensive weapon. But if any country were about to invade a foreign country, if Germany were about to invade France, or France to invade Germany, certainly one of the most offensive weapons they could have to take with them would be mobile antiaircraft guns with which to shoot down the enemy's defensive planes.

I recall that during the World War we had a great number of tremendous coast-defense guns which we had had constructed for defensive purposes and which we thought of as defensive weapons—the largest guns under the control of the United States. Yet when we got into the war in a foreign field we took those coast-defense guns to France, mounted them on railroad trains, and used them as the heaviest offensive weapons we had. Therefore it seems to me that the fact that offensive weapons and defensive weapons cannot be segregated in any intelligent manner is the strongest possible argument for an embargo on all arms, because it is not possible to segregate the defensive from the offensive weapons.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. CONNALLY. The distinguished Senator from Missouri placed in the RECORD the Lindbergh statement, and I take it he approves the policy advocated in it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The fact that I placed Colonel Lindbergh's very eloquent and very patriotic speech in the RECORD does not necessarily mean that I agree with everything in it. I agree with the theory of Colonel Lindbergh's speech very thoroughly and very completely. It does not follow that on this particular question I am in agreement with Colonel Lindbergh.

Mr. CONNALLY. I made the statement in view of the remark of the Senator from Missouri a few moments ago that Colonel Lindbergh's statement was one of the finest, and one of the most patriotic speeches that had ever come to his notice.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I still say so; but I do not agree with him as to the possibility of distinction between offensive and defensive weapons.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator from Missouri knows there is no difference between an offensive and a defensive article. But Colonel Lindbergh and Mr. Hoover both say that the arms embargo ought to be lifted on defensive weapons. That cannot be done under the present embargo law. Therefore, it is fair to infer that they believe that the embargo should be repealed to the extent it would apply to defensive weapons. If that is done, it is repealed as to all weapons, because, as the Senator from Missouri recognizes, there is no difference, and the Senator from Minnesota recognizes that there is no difference.

Let us assume that we are attacked by an army of tanks. What is the defense against tanks? It is more tanks. What is a cannon? We can sell belligerents cannon for defense, but not for offense, let us say. A cannon is both offensive and defensive, to hammer down the walls of a fort, or to defend against an army.

A point was made about bombing planes. A bombing plane is both an offensive and a defensive weapon. Let us assume an army is marching to attack us, and we have bombing planes. Is it not legitimate to send out those bombing planes and let them bomb that army in our defense? Is not the bombing plane a defensive weapon, just as it is an offensive weapon?

What is a bayonet but an offensive and a defensive weapon, a bayonet to stop the onrush of soldiers, or to enable others to go out and attack them?

Then there is the airplane. What is the answer to an airplane attack? It is more airplanes, to go out and defeat those which are attacking.

What is the function of antiaircraft guns? It is to shoot down aircraft, if they are coming toward you, and, as the Senator from Kentucky suggested, having them movable so that they may be taken out to attack airplanes.

All weapons are both defensive and offensive, and when Mr. Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh say that we ought to sell the Allies or anybody else who can come and get them defensive weapons, it means that they favor the repeal of the arms embargo. There is no other logic to it. It cannot be understood in any other way.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Texas, and I hope this point will be further debated on the floor of the Senate. To my mind, as I have stated before, I cannot at the present moment draw any line of distinction between offensive and defensive weapons.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think I can draw the line for the Senator.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Very well; I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. On the question as to whether or not an implement of war, using the illustration of a tank, is an offensive or a defensive instrument, it depends entirely upon the use to which it is put. I think that is the answer to that.

A moment ago the Senator stated that he was somewhat surprised, at least I judged that he was entertaining surprise in his mind, about the Polish defense having been wiped out so readily with apparently no difficulty. The answer to that is this: The Polish leaders deserted the troops, and the troops deserted the weapons. That is the answer.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I cannot quite agree with that statement in full. It is true that some of the leaders, among them the commander in chief, deserted, and their President deserted, but the Polish soldiers fought on bravely as best they could. Finally there had to be a surrender.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, Mr. President, but I was only making that observation as a result of newspaper reports. And we find today that the Polish Government is reassembling in France, although reports we have had are to the effect that they had mostly gone to Rumania and Hungary, and we learned—at least I did—from the reports that I have seen, that the only man who stood his ground was the mayor of Warsaw.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In connection with the four points in Colonel Lindbergh's address made last night, to which the Senator from Wisconsin has called attention, No. 1 is an embargo on offensive weapons and munitions, and No. 2 the unrestricted sale of purely defensive arms, and as no one can tell the difference between offensive and defensive arms, those two points check each other out, so we will eliminate them.

The other two are: No. 3, the prohibition of American shipping from the belligerent countries of Europe and their danger zones, which this measure does; and No. 4, the refusal of credit to belligerent nations or their agents, which this measure does, subject only to the 90-day provision, which is a restriction and not a privilege, because without that or without any similar provision, except for the matter of publicly floated bonds of foreign governments and their political subdivisions, there is nothing in the present law or in any bill that anyone has yet introduced to prevent individual citizens of the United States from selling commodities to any foreign nation, belligerent or otherwise, on such terms of credit as they might see fit to give.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should like ultimately to submit a question to the Senator from Minnesota, but before



doing so I want to join in what has been said by everyone here in reference to the speech of Colonel Lindbergh. I certainly agree with the Senator from Missouri that it was an outstanding speech and was a statement which clearly showed that Colonel Lindbergh is a thoroughly patriotic American.

The discussion which has ensued here on the part of those on both sides of this question indicates a belief that the difficulty with the suggestion of both former President Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh of distinguishing between offensive and defensive weapons is a practical one. An understanding of the use of weapons shows that the distinction cannot be made so far as the weapons themselves are concerned. I do not think anyone can doubt, however, that both former President Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh have made a contribution to this discussion by the recognition of the fact that there is a difference between the use to which weapons are put. There is a difference between an offense and a defense. Having made that distinction, and it having been pointed out that the distinction cannot be made upon the basis of the nature of the weapons themselves, then to follow through the logic of both of the gentlemen it must be based upon the difference in the campaign being conducted by the one nation as against another. There may be—and I know there is—very great difference of opinion as to the use of weapons manufactured in the United States and sold to England and to France.

I now wish to submit the question to the Senator from Minnesota. On the basis of the distinction made by these two distinguished gentlemen, if Russia goes through with her present apparent plan of insisting upon Finland giving her the Aland Islands, insisting upon Norway, Sweden, and Denmark being subsidiary to the Russian Communist form of government, and these Scandinavian governments determined to defend themselves, I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he thinks that any weapons that Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland might use to protect themselves against the aggression of Communist Russia could be considered anything else than defensive weapons?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will say to the able Senator that I think it is pretty well understood that these small nations are not engaged in offense. They are trying to defend themselves as best they can. I wish to add, however, that it is not our Europe, it is not our war, no matter what nation it hits. This is our hemisphere over here.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The Senator may remember that last week, in discussing this question generally, I read from a number of authorities, going back as far as 1758, which agreed that a nation which had an arms embargo and refused to ship arms and implements of war to warring nations in an instance when there was a well-prepared aggressor attacking a defenseless smaller nation, which would have as its source of arms this other neutral which had refused to sell arms because of an arms embargo, that the net effect of that was for that neutral to become the ally of the large aggressor nation.

In the event Russia goes through and attacks Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he wants the United States to become an ally of Communist Russia against these Scandinavian countries?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Well, I think we can cross that bridge when we reach it. I do not believe we have gotten to that point yet. I do not think we are at that point. We have plenty of problems confronting us today that we had better solve before we go into hypothetical questions such as that.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The answer the Senator makes is precisely the answer certain gentlemen made in the For-

ign Relations Committee last summer, that we should not touch this question at that time; that we should wait until we saw what happened; we should wait and meet that problem when it came up. Now they are arguing that it is too late to change the law because we are already in a situation where war exists between England, France, and Germany. And when the Senator from Minnesota says, "Wait and let us not touch that point until we reach it," he is presenting the same argument. If the time comes within the next 3 or 4 weeks, as we must realize it may come, when Finland refuses to accede to demands made upon it, and Norway, Sweden, and Denmark decide to support Finland, and the war then comes on, will the Senator then say, "Well, we cannot do anything about that because it will be unneutral, since the war has already started"?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I endeavored to answer the Senator's previous question, that it is not our Europe and it is not our war, and we put up the bars against being entangled in Europe. That ought to be sufficient answer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to say a word, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Washington, as to the argument which was made in the Foreign Relations Committee for a postponement of any action in the last session of Congress. I wish to say that no such argument was advanced in the Foreign Relations Committee, or, so far as I know, any place else, by those in favor of not taking any action at the last session of the Congress. I made that motion in the Foreign Relations Committee myself, and nothing that I have ever done in my life gives me greater pride and pleasure than that I did it. I made that motion in the Foreign Relations Committee, not because I thought we had any notion of allowing things to drift. I made that motion in the Foreign Relations Committee because I was opposed to changing then, or now, a provision that we had made dispassionately several years ago, before any particular situation developed, for the purpose of keeping us out of war, by establishing a system of neutrality, without reference to any particular set of belligerents, but which would apply to any situation which might develop.

Let me say further, Mr. President, since the subject has been brought up here, that it is my profound belief that it is one of the most fortunate things that ever happened in our country that this embargo section was not repealed at the last session of Congress, because if it had been repealed at the last session of Congress, we would not have had this extra session of Congress, we would not have had a chance to debate this subject before the American people, and, in my opinion, judging from some of the things that have already happened in the country, we might have had government by decree in the United States right now.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I dislike very much to disagree on a question of recollection with the Senator from Missouri, because I do not need to say to the Members of this body that there is no one here whose attempt to recollect what went on would be any greater than the Senator from Missouri, and no one would misstate his recollection of what occurred. But I very vividly remember what went on in that discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not want to discuss that further than to point out that the motion made by the Senator from Missouri was not a motion to defeat the proposal. It was not a proposition of defeating it. It was not a proposition of letting it get on the floor and being defeated here. It was purely a question, I think the language was, of postponing action on the pending legislation until the next session of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It did defeat the legislation in the last session of Congress.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Perhaps that may have been the Senator's intention in making the motion, but nevertheless, the motion was not for defeat but for delay. I remember very distinctly pointing out to the members of the committee that the philosophy behind the neutrality legislation when it was adopted was that we would create a status before the war started.

I know that one of the members of the committee was very scornful of my remarks and said that there was not going to be a war in Europe, anyway, and that if we just did not do anything there would be no possibility of a war in Europe this summer.

Regardless of that fact, Senators argue about the motives actuating members of the committee. Regardless of whether or not the statement to which the Senator refers was made, the newspapers every day indicate that Russia is determined to control the Baltic, to seize the Aaland Islands, and then go on and control Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, and that those nations are not going to permit it.

This is not merely a matter of legislation about a war which is already set over there between England and France on one side and Germany on the other side. During the past 3 weeks events have shown that the war has completely changed and that a number of other nations will probably become involved. When we are passing upon the question we cannot say, as the Senator from Minnesota says, "Just let the matter rest for the present," because if conditions turn out as it seems they will turn out, the same people will say, "You cannot do anything about that; the war has started, and it would be unneutral to change our position after the war started."

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. I am glad that at last some of the administration spokesmen are going to join with some of us in opposing communism. For a long while we have been opposing communism and have been balked by an administration honeycombed with communism. Now that Russia is opposing England, we find that communism is a bad thing. They have put back on communism the whiskers that they took off when they thought Russia would be with them.

#### WASHINGTON, JEFFERSON, JACKSON, AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, of course, this discussion is very interesting, and the debate will go on as to defensive and offensive weapons, and as to what will happen in Europe. However, I hope this Nation will finally resolve, with Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson, not to become involved in Europe's quarrels and real-estate disputes over titles and boundaries.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 11, 1939, concerning the war debts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington Times-Herald of June 11, 1939]

#### THE GOOD OLD WAR DEBTS

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH (Republican), of Idaho, thinks it would be a good idea for us to indulge in some public discussion of the unpaid war debts while the King and Queen of Great Britain are visiting in the United States.

We admire the isolationism of the Lion of Idaho, and are practically as isolationist ourselves as he is.

But in this instance we don't think Senator BORAH has given birth to either a hospitable or a basically sound idea.

In the first place, their Britannic Majesties are on a good-will tour, anxious to furbish up the friendship that exists between the United States and the British Empire. That is entirely legitimate. It is only recently that some nations' rulers have come to feel that the way for a nation to get along in the world is to win for itself the dislike of as many other nations as it can. The usual thing in peacetime, and we think still the sensible thing, is for a nation to make as many friends for itself as it can.

We ought to be as hospitable and polite to the King and Queen as we know how to be.

But that is not the only reason why we would be wise to soft-pedal further talk of collecting the war debts.

Data on these debts will be revised and made public in the next few days, June 15 being the next due date. Meanwhile here is the way the reckoning stood on the last due date, December 15, 1938:

Country	Funded debt	Total paid	Balance due
Great Britain.....	\$4,368,000,000	\$2,024,848,817	\$3,160,881,946
France.....	3,863,650,000	486,075,891	3,615,144,293
Italy.....	2,004,900,000	100,829,880	1,917,643,827
Belgium.....	400,680,000	52,191,273	384,125,505
Russia.....	371,038,000	8,750,312	362,288,407
Poland.....	206,057,000	22,646,297	226,347,092
Czechoslovakia.....	165,241,000	20,134,092	145,486,178
Rumania.....	63,860,000	4,791,007	57,170,663
Yugoslavia.....	61,625,000	2,588,772	59,036,228
Greece.....	31,516,000	3,788,384	29,855,341
Austria.....	23,752,000	862,668	23,114,012
Estonia.....	16,466,000	1,248,432	18,607,575
Finland.....	8,270,000	5,192,762	3,241,762
Latvia.....	6,879,000	761,549	7,416,535
Lithuania.....	6,197,000	1,237,956	6,080,906
Hungary.....	1,908,000	488,466	1,803,559
Total.....	11,900,039,000	2,734,436,558	10,018,243,899

The "Balance due" column includes accrued interest.

#### CANCEL THEM, BUT DON'T FORGET THEM

In our opinion, we should make no further attempts to collect these debts. We should charge them off under the head of experience, which, according to the old proverb, keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other.

We cannot collect the debts anyway. We have more gold than we know what to do with now. The only other possible payment would be in goods. We could accept large quantities of goods duty free in payment of the debts, but these in most cases would compete with our own goods and ruin a lot of our business houses. The only way we can profitably increase trade with Europe is by reciprocity—their agreement to receive as much in goods from us as we receive from them. This has nothing to do with the war debts.

#### MEMORIES OF PONZI

There is a limit to everything, though. We think the limit of something or other was reached recently, when the British and the French began hinting that they might resume war-debt payments.

Really, that talk reminds us of a once-famous gent named Charles Ponzi. This Massachusetts swindler, in the summer of 1920, became a hero to a lot of suckers on the strength of his promise to borrow money from you and return it plus 50 percent in 45 days. For awhile he made good by an intricate process of kiting International Postal Union reply coupons. You sent him \$10; 45 days later, he sent you \$15. Then you sent him \$20, and in 45 days it came back increased to \$30.

But when the law got after Ponzi and the kited paper got to flying around too fast, it came to a point where a lot of people sent Ponzi \$150 or so apiece, and Ponzi sent them back nothing at all.

Our onetime Allies are now thinking of playing a similar game on us, it would seem. We sent them eleven billions for the war and its aftermath; they sent us about two and one-half billions. Now they are talking about paying us a few million dollars as "token payments," in token of the fact that they know they owe us the money. We know that anyway.

And in return for these small token payments of a few millions now, they will expect us to send them as many billions later, when they are in another war.

The scheme makes Ponzi look like a very small-time operator. We hope the American people aren't such suckers as all that.

#### CAN WE AFFORD TO FORGET THE DEBTS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Think of it. The editorial policy of this great daily is so American it tells us to forgive and cancel the war debts. Just how can the editor of the Times-Herald justify any such un-American, foreign-minded, European-minded position? That editorial certainly speaks loudly for itself. I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article from the Hudson News, of Union City, N. J., telling how France "soaked" the United States during the war, charging rent for everything and tariffs on everything, and now finally we learn that the French are charging rent on the graves where our hero dead rest. If the rent is not paid they are thrown out and cremated. This shows gratitude on the part of European nations for the great efforts of the American Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THEY "SOAKED" THE UNITED STATES

[From the Hudson News, Union City, N. J., April 1939]

JERSEYITE TELLS HOW FRANCE "SOAKED" UNITED STATES DURING WAR—WE REPAIRED ALL ROADS, STREETS, AND RAILROADS USED BY OUR TRUCKS AND TRAINS, PAID RENT FOR EVERY FOOT OF GROUND WHILE SAVING THEM, AND THEN SOLD THEM \$2,000,000,000 WORTH OF SUPPLIES FOR NINE HUNDRED MILLION AND NEVER COLLECTED A DIME, THANKS TO WILSON

(By George Biehl)

President Roosevelt is hoping that a war will be started to take the people's minds off his own New Deal failure.



To those people who think we should save England and France once more, this article is intended to reveal something that has rarely been touched upon—the huge profits made by France and England from the American Army and how they used the United States as a sucker nation while we were saving them from annihilation 20 years ago.

#### IMPOSED ON US

This writer was an American soldier who served 14 months in France as a member of the Railway Transportation Corps assigned to the Service of Supply, 11 months of which were at Nantes and 3 months at St. Nazaire.

During that period I had more opportunities to discover how we were being imposed upon by the French Government than thousands of other American soldiers who were sent up to the front to fight.

#### "SAVE US, OR—"

It was not until the armistice was signed that some Americans outside governmental or Army circles began to learn how easily President Woodrow Wilson and Gen. John J. Pershing permitted us to be dupes of England and France when it came to transporting and quartering American troops overseas.

We went into the World War after Wilson's reelection in 1916 on his solemn pledge to "keep us out of war" because England and France sent high officials to the United States imploring:

"Our backs are to the wall! Save us or we perish!"

#### DEMANDED TROOPS

As soon as he got Congress to declare war on Germany, Wilson then had loans of billions of governmental dollars made to the Allies so they could pay J. P. Morgan & Co.—their agents—the money they owed American munitions men and to buy additional supplies.

But this was not enough. England and France demanded our men as well as our dollars, so we began to assemble a large Army to send overseas to save our "democratic brethren."

When the time came to transport these badly needed American troops overseas England supplied the troop ships.

#### CRAFTY BRITISH

Free transportation? Of course not. From the time the war began in 1914 England coined a phrase that soon became known throughout the world as a symbol of British fortitude, and that phrase was:

"Business as usual."

And the crafty British applied that phrase to the United States when it came to transporting our soldiers to France to save both England and France "or we perish."

#### PAID AND PAID

By orders of Woodrow Wilson the United States Government paid England a transportation rate for each soldier taken to England on British ships that was said to be higher than steerage passenger rates.

Yet the cramped sleeping quarters of our troops and the food given to them on British ships was worse than any ever given to any steerage passenger in history.

England was willing to supply all the troop ships needed but evidently because of this hold-up the United States began a vast ship-building campaign to send its men and supplies across in its own bottoms.

#### AT A PROFIT

As many of the troops as possible were sent direct to France but others had to be landed in England and transported in freight trains across England to Dover where they embarked for Calais on Channel boats.

The United States paid England for this railway and Channel boat transportation at so much per head, as well as rent for quarters for each man while he stayed in England, all at a profit to the "business as usual" British Government.

#### RENT BEHIND LINES

General Pershing once indignantly denied that we paid rent for the front-line trenches occupied by American troops while we were saving France and England.

That was true, but we did pay rent to France for every foot of quarters we occupied immediately behind the front-line trenches as well as transportation charges whenever French railway trains or other French facilities were used to ship our soldiers up to the front for battle.

#### WE REPAVED ROADS

I do not know if we paid toll for use of French streets and roads by our own motor trucks, or use of French railroads by our own freight trains, but I was told that after the war was over we repaved with French labor and put in first-class condition every French road or street on which an American truck or Army automobile had been used during the war.

I was also told that we ripped up the 80-pound rails on the French railroads used by our own freight trains and replaced them with brand-new 120-pound American steel rails.

#### BETTER RAILROADS

As American freight trains were used during the war on nearly every through French railroad, we practically re-made every French railroad over by putting them in better condition with heavier and stronger steel rails than they ever had been in before.

And this, of course, was in addition to the enormous amount of money dumped into France by individual American soldiers and officers who spent their monthly pay as fast as they got it.

#### MODERN PORT

St. Nazaire, a seaport on the northwest coast of France, where the first American troops landed, was a city of 20,000 population, which had a modern system of docking facilities for steamships, consisting of two huge basins able to berth and handle loading and unloading of 16 or more large ocean liners at one time.

There was a considerable rise and fall in the tide, but these basins permitted the ships to remain at one level while in port.

Entrance to these basins from the outside breakwater was by a small canal with locks, the gates being operated by waterpower. No more than four ships could be moved on each tide, or eight a day.

#### MORE CHARGES

I am sure we paid toll for each of our ships that went through this lock, and berthing and warehouse charges, because I know that each ship was guided into the lock by at least two French tugboats.

From the latter part of April 1919 to July 3, the same year, when I embarked for home, it was my duty to check the use of these tugs by our ships at St. Nazaire so that the United States could not be overcharged by the French Government. I replaced another soldier who was sent home because he had been in France longer than me.

So if they charged for use of the tugs, they certainly made us pay for use of the docks and warehouses.

#### TOWN PROSPERED

We were told that while St. Nazaire's modern docking facilities were only about 20 years old, the port did little business before arrival of American troops in the war. It then became one of our chief ports of debarkation. By an unusual coincidence I left France from the very same docking berth where I landed at St. Nazaire.

Before we went into the war the people of St. Nazaire were chiefly made of a struggling, working class. Only a few could afford to wear leather shoes and cotton stockings.

But a short time after 40,000 American soldiers were regularly quartered at Camp Lusitania, just outside the town—a temporary stopping-off place for them on their way to the front—practically everybody in town began wearing leather shoes, and nearly all the women and girls began wearing silk stockings. The United States also constructed a modern water-supply system for the city.

#### OUR OWN TRAINS

I had been rejected by the Army in July 1917 because I only weighed 110 pounds. I was accepted at the same weight in February 1918, and after a short time in Camp Meade, Md., was selected among 160 clerks, salesmen, actors, and railroad men for the first contingent of the newly organized Railway Transportation Corps, formed at the request of Brig. Gen. W. W. Atterbury, of the Pennsylvania Railroad, who shortly after arriving in France, saw that we had to operate our own trains if we intended to win the war in a hurry.

We left Hoboken for France on April 23, 1918, but 2 days out had a collision with another troopship in our convoy. Both ships returned alone to Hoboken and we left there again a week later, on April 30, on another ship in another convoy.

#### WORK BEGINS

We arrived at St. Nazaire on May 13, and after a week there were sent to a French artillery school at Angers, 60 miles up the Loire River from St. Nazaire, where we drilled for 2 weeks while being classified to be sent to different ports and railheads in France.

Thirteen of us, including myself, were sent 20 miles back toward St. Nazaire, to Nantes, an inland port on the Loire River, for cargo ships with a population of 200,000 and the sixth largest city in France.

We formed the nucleus of a later increased force of American soldiers who supervised the unloading of American ships and the loading of the supplies on freight trains for shipment into France and to the front.

#### SHANGHAIED CHINESE

I don't know what arrangements were made between the United States and the French Government at other ports in France, but I did discover a lot of what went on in Nantes and St. Nazaire.

At Nantes the United States hired members of the local longshoremen's union. In the beginning we augmented their services with Chinese laborers, all natives of French Indochina, who told us they had been shanghaied and sent to France.

These Chinese were better fitted for farming than laboring and we were informed that the United States paid the French Government 7 francs per day for each man's hire. A franc was then worth its full value of more than 19 cents. The French gave the Chinese 4 francs as pay, charging them 3 francs a day to let them sleep on bare wood slabs on the stone floors of their barracks, feeding them with rice and tea three times a day with a piece of meat about a cubic inch thick thrown in at noon time.

#### STRIKE BEGINS

When the rainy weather set in in the fall each Chinese was compelled to buy a raincoat from the French Government for 25 francs. The first day the men used these coats they came to us crying, showing us how easily the "rubber" peeled off the fabric. They looked little better than cheesecloth covered with rubber paint.

When we started operations at Nantes the French longshoremen were glad to get work at regular union wages but as soon as our ships began to arrive rapidly enough to require day and night work 7 days a week the Frenchmen demanded an increase in pay which was refused.

A 24-hour strike brought the American Government to terms and we were told Uncle Sam had to pay the increased wages from then on.

We were impressed by our superiors with the idea that we were to fill all freight cars to the allowable 10 percent overload to make use of all available freight space to help win the war, but the French laborers refused to lift anything higher than their shoulders.

When we remonstrated with them that we wanted to win the war to save their country they bluntly told us:

"To hell with the war! We don't care how long it lasts."

All of them were misfits who were physically unfit for their own army.

#### PRISONERS EFFICIENT

It was not until September 1918 when we received 1,000 German prisoners captured by our own men in the St. Mihiel drive, that all of the freight cars were loaded at our port to their capacity. From then on the French laborers worked in the holds of ships and the German prisoners handled all loading of freight cars on the docks.

The Germans seemed more anxious than any of us to get the war over with so they could get home to their families as soon as possible.

After each ship from the United States was unloaded we noticed rows of new steel railroad rails at the bottoms of the holds which we were informed were for ballast when the ships returned empty to the United States.

#### RAILS UNLOADED

But after the armistice was signed all of these rails were unloaded. It was then that we were told they were to be used to replace all rails on French railroads used by our freight trains at expense of the United States.

For weeks at a time before the armistice we were engaged in unloading nothing but cargoes of potatoes from Ireland and coal from Wales, for our Army, purchased from Great Britain by the United States. The United States also purchased large quantities of uniforms and other Army equipment made in England, much of which was unloaded at our port.

#### PORT CLOSED

On April 1, 1919, the United States made preparations to abandon Nantes. There were then 200 of us in our outfit: 50 were to be sent home, 50 to Bordeaux, 50 to St. Nazaire, and the remainder were to finish up work at the port.

I was one of those sent to St. Nazaire. After the armistice was signed we had been informed that we would be among the last to leave France, as it would be our duty to ship the fighting men back.

#### BUSY PLACE

When we arrived at St. Nazaire there were 1,300 of our white troops and 6,000 American Negro soldiers engaged in shipping our men back to America. The Army transports went back and forth from that port to the United States, like ferryboats, loaded with troops.

With two other men, a corporal and a sergeant, I was assigned to classify all of the 1,300 white troops, including ourselves, for shipment home in batches of 100 according to their conduct and length of service at home and in France.

When we finished the job in 2 weeks each of us was promoted one grade, so I became a corporal.

#### ROADS REPAVED

I was then assigned to my job of checking the tugs used by our ships and was one of the few enlisted men given a 24-hour pass to come and go wherever and whenever I pleased.

One afternoon as I was walking along the main road from the camp to the docks I saw a large group of French laborers engaged in repaving the street. They were not merely repairing spots but were engaged in completely repaving it.

#### SOAKED AGAIN

My curiosity was aroused because they were being supervised by several American Army officers. I walked up to a second lieutenant, saluted, and asked him if he would kindly inform me why American officers were supervising the job and he replied:

"The United States made an agreement with France to repave every road and street used by our trucks with French laborers at the expense of Uncle Sam. That's why there was a jail penalty for any American truck driver caught on any street or road he was not authorized to use in his area. We didn't want to repave all the streets and roads in France."

#### TRUCK BONFIRE

We shipped hundreds of new locomotives and thousands of freight cars, motortrucks, and automobiles to France for our Army. As soon as the war was over it was decided that it would be too costly to ship these back to the United States.

France was asked to buy the trucks. The French officials knew we could not ship them home so they merely said they had no use for them.

Soon after that a high American Army officer had his men assemble several hundred Army trucks on which they dumped bales of hay. They were then saturated with kerosene and set on fire.

French newspapers loudly denounced this "wanton waste" of valuable property but the officer in charge merely stated:

"The French Government doesn't want them; we don't want them; so the only thing to do is to burn them up."

The French Government immediately offered to buy them, but the United States then asked for bids by any country on the Continent as we could not deliver them by boat.

Before I left France on July 3, 1919, the French Government was already selling at a profit—not giving away—the huge stock of American shoes, uniforms, and other supplies to its own people.

We knew at the time that France had purchased these supplies at a low cost but it was not until 1931 that I met a man in Washington who told me how France obtained them.

This man was an officer in the Quartermaster Corps in Washington. He was an expert on shoes. Shortly after the armistice he said two commissions were appointed to go to France. One was to negotiate the sale to France or to any country on the continent the huge amount of supplies we could not ship back to the United States.

#### A SELL-OUT

The other commission was to appraise the value of all supplies there, which was estimated to have cost us \$2,000,000,000. The sales commission was already on the high seas and the appraisal commission, of which this man was a member, was ready to embark from New York when the trip was canceled and they were ordered back to Washington.

Word had been received, he said, that Brig. Gen. "Hell and Maria" Dawes, with full consent of President Wilson and General Pershing, had sold our entire stock of supplies that cost us \$2,000,000,000, including locomotives, freight cars, and motortrucks, to France for a flat sum of \$900,000,000.

And to this day, I understand, we have not been paid 5 cents of the \$900,000,000.

#### SOAKED AGAIN

While still in France I heard that hundreds of French citizens bilked the United States Government out of thousands of dollars by presenting claims that American Army trucks had ruined their clothes by splashing mud or had broken their plate-glass windows by hitting stones which flipped against the windows.

I was informed by one American officer that in practically every instance the United States Government paid these claims, many of which were fraudulent.

#### ANOTHER CASE

Before we left Nantes for St. Nazaire in the spring of 1919 the former city was being used as a stopping-off place for American troops on their way to St. Nazaire for embarkation home due to the crowded condition of the latter city.

An abandoned set of barracks that used to be an American Army venereal-disease camp was located between our quarters and the main docks. Some of the returning troops were housed in these barracks until there was room for them at St. Nazaire.

#### EXORBITANT RENT

One day as we were coming back from work at the docks we saw a new company of American troops pitching their "pup" tents on the ground along the side of the road near the barracks. We asked a sergeant why and he replied:

"Our captain said he didn't mind so much the fact that this used to be a venereal camp but when he found out the exorbitant rent the French Government demanded he'd be damned if he'd sign for them and said he would make us sleep on the ground instead."

#### GERMANS SOAKED

If General Pershing was chiefly responsible for all of these outrageous hold-ups by the country we went to war to save he acted just the opposite with conquered Germany.

Shortly after the American Army of Occupation moved into Germany I had read that Pershing had ordered the German authorities to compel the German people to supply his Army of Occupation with enough bed linen free of charge so that each of his men would be able to sleep between sheets.

#### "BLACK JACK"

We never had sheets in France or in the United States but "Black Jack" Pershing was a terror when it came to the conquered German populace, yet he permitted us to be blackjacked right and left for payment for everything by France.

This is probably why France decorated him as one of their heroes.

It seems we saved France and England from destruction by Germany; paid them for everything while we were saving them, and to this day have never collected the money they borrowed or payment for what they bought from us for a song.

It will take a lot of propaganda by Roosevelt to get many of the boys who were in France or England in the last war to be willing to have us go into another war on the side of the same ungrateful nations.

In fact, most of us at Nantes when the armistice was signed wished the United States would then declare war on England and France so we could clean them all up at the same time for the impositions they practiced on us.

#### HOW ABOUT AMERICA?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I think we should give a little more attention to the unemployed in the United States, and to our economic situation here at home. We should



give attention to the statement made the other day by Harry Hopkins, which I quote offhand:

Do not let this war emergency mislead you into thinking that the unemployed in this country will be absorbed by the war emergency.

Unemployment has reached too large a figure. Time and time again I have said, "Let us turn back to the American scene. Let us withdraw from the bloody conflicts in the Old World." Our fathers left there to get away from war taxation, to get away from quarrels and boundary disputes, and disputes over real-estate titles in Europe. They left to come over here and set up a government under which they could be free from the entanglements and insidious influences of Europe. Why can we not pay a little attention to the warnings and the faith of the fathers and founders of this country?

No; we are wise now. Our forefathers died a long time ago. We shall be fortunate if we have any country after another world war if we enter that world war. Many of the most distinguished Americans today predict an absolute, total loss of democracy in this country after another world war. We have survived, with some headaches, after the last war, although we have still yet to reach the peak of \$100,000,000,000 indebtedness which President Coolidge estimated after the last soldier and the last dependent of a soldier shall have passed from the scene. We have not yet reached that peak. We have not yet built all the hospitals we need for the wounded and shell-shocked of the last war.

Senators rise in the Senate and talk about helping France and Britain, and bringing on a war which would result, not in 125,000 dead and 200,000 or 300,000 wounded, but perhaps millions, when we shall intrude ourselves into the continental quarrels of the Old World. It might be well to turn our attention a little to the debts which now rest heavily upon the backs of the American taxpayers, and consider whether or not our citizens will permit further burdens to be placed upon them.

I want to warn the businessmen of America, as I warned them once before in 1917 when I was but a young Member of the House. I think it will have to be said that there was some truth in the statements I tried to make, to the effect that the war taxation would be oppressive. If we enter another world war the taxation will become confiscatory. We shall be taxing fortunes, properties, corporations, and corporations' rights and privileges until American businessmen may find themselves poverty stricken and without the wealth that they had piled heaven-high in this rich and wonderful and marvelous America. The best way to protect American business, and thereby protect American labor, which obtains its employment from American business, is to keep America out of that war, and to seek to remain away from involvement in such a war.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I can heartily agree with the conclusion of the Senator; but in view of his previous statements I should like to ask him a series of questions.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Not too many.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator know any businessman who wants to get this country into war?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Any businessman who wants to get this country into war?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not believe I made any such statement; but if I may refer to the prior World War, I do remember a firm which had \$400,000,000 invested in British loans. When England said, "We have our backs against the wall and we are going down in defeat, and we cannot pay the \$400,000,000," then the propaganda began to be placed before the Congress of the United States that it would be a good thing to get into the war; and we found that on the day we went into the World War the \$400,000,000 burden was taken off the backs of Morgan & Co. and put on the backs of the American taxpayers, where it still rests. That is one firm of American businessmen to which I may refer on this occasion.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator refers to a situation which came into being as a result of credits some twenty-odd years ago. In view of the debates which have taken place here, I feel that the American people are entitled to know whether or not the Senator has any knowledge of any group or any businessman who wants to get this country into war. If he answers that question "No" then I should like to know whether or not he knows of any labor group which wants to get the United States into war. If he answers that question "No" I should like to know whether or not he knows of any professional group, or any fathers or mothers who want to get us into war. In fact, I should like to know whether or not he knows of anybody who wants to get America into war.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I do not presume that even those who want to help the British and French want us to get into this war. I do not presume that anyone in the United States wants to get us into war. I was a Member of the Sixty-fifth Congress when the great Robert M. La Follette sat in the seat before me, and when Lindbergh, who had made many speeches on the subject, was just leaving the House. Everybody was for keeping out of war. Oh, yes; all Members of Congress were all for peace. They were for keeping out of war. But it was camouflage. That is all it was. I presume that those who are today in favor of helping Britain and France are for peace, and for keeping out of war.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, before America could get into any war there would have to be a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States, would there not?

Mr. LUNDEEN. That is conceded, of course.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator know of any Senator who would vote for war?

Mr. LUNDEEN. The only guide we have is the lamp of past experience, and I think I have a right to revert to the days of the World War again because the war now raging is again called a World War. Immediately prior to the last war I met in the Halls of Congress scores of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who swore that they would never vote for war. They were for arming ships; they were for this and that position, but they would never vote for war. Yet they did vote for war, and I assume they will do the same thing again. At the present moment it is my belief that a majority of the House and Senate would vote for war today under certain conditions such as obtained during the first World War. I hope I am wrong; I pray to God I am wrong, as I did on the occasion referred to. April 6, 1917, I hoped then I was wrong; but I was right, for there were only 6 United States Senators on the floor of the Senate who voted "no," and there were only 50 Members of the House of Representatives who voted "no"; the others voted for war, although they had theretofore been campaigning on a platform to keep out of war and vowing that we would never get into war.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I make a further suggestion?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think there has been too much "assumption" and "argument by assumption" on the floor of the Senate. I think that when Senators of the United States take a position and speak from this forum on the basis of assumption they should guard their lips. Out yonder there are 130,000,000 people, including 30,000,000 youth, who are listening, who are entitled to be guided and guarded by the words that are uttered by those who are supposedly statesmen. When the poison of fear and dread is implanted in their minds by words spoken here, although no man can point to one Representative or one Senator who would vote for war, I say we had better guard our lips, for we owe a responsibility to the people of America.

Anyone who understands psychology at all must know that dread and fear are important factors in life, and when we seek to influence the minds of our people, many of whom are now in a state of hysteria because of what has been said in this debate, I think a word of caution should be uttered. That is the stand I take now. I have not said how I shall vote on the

pending question. I was not here when the original Neutrality Act was passed. I have been listening to the debates; I say that when Senators rise and speak, as they speak with authority and their voices are heard among their constituents, they should guard what they say, because the power of their utterances may be destructive power.

Let me reply to the Senator from Minnesota by saying that when he takes his guidance from 20 years ago he proceeds on the assumption that America has not learned anything. America has learned; and I say with conviction that no Senator—Republican, Democrat, or Independent—under conditions similar to those which existed 20 years ago, would vote for war. We are trying here to find the correct answer to a great problem. We cannot find it by smearing Britain and France on the one side and smearing Germany and Hitler on the other. It is through calm processes, through sane thinking, yes, through prayer and contemplation that we will find the answer. It will not be by impassioned appeals to prejudice. No. Let us guard our tongues, for we are the guardsmen at the gate. [Applause.]

#### KEEPING OUT OF WAR

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the able Senator, but I wish to say that I will not cease speaking about Britain and France and their broken and violated word while the millions of our citizens are starving to death and they owe us billions of dollars. Britain produces more than half the gold of the world, and their diamonds and platinum mines had to be shut down because their products glut the market. Great Britain and France are loaning money to everybody on earth for the sake of strengthening their empires. Under such circumstances I will not be silent on the Senate floor. I am going to warn the American people, as best I can, of the impending danger, similar to that which I saw as a young man on the floor of the House in the Sixty-fifth Congress. I was in fear then that the Congress would vote for war, though all the Members of the Congress said they were for peace; they all said they were for keeping out of war; yet within 6 months of the time they said they were all for keeping us out they came in and voted for war.

The Senator gives me a most encouraging statement that America has learned. I am sure America has learned, and I hope that all Senators and Representatives in Congress have learned.

I shall be very happy, indeed, to put down on the roll call the name of the able Senator from Wisconsin as voting against war.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes, indeed; I will; I am delighted to yield. I have great respect for the opinion of the able Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I have just one further suggestion to make. It is common knowledge on the floor of the Senate, and as stated in the newspaper columns, that this body will vote for repeal of the embargo. A great many Senators, and others over the radio, let us say, have suggested to the American people that if we repeal the embargo it will be the first step toward war, while, on the other side, it is said if we do not repeal the embargo it will be the first step toward war. So we have in our country two factions, educated by the so-called leaders of America to think that war must inevitably come if their side loses in this debate. Is that constructive thinking? Is that giving leadership to America? Have we in America become so dumb that, because we take one step either in one direction or the other it must mean war? Anyone can see that there are a thousand steps that might lead to war; but the chief step that would lead to war is to create a condition of mental hysteria, and, as we are proceeding now, we are falsely educating a large percentage of the people to think that if the embargo is repealed it means war, and falsely educating another large group of people to think that if it is not repealed it means war. Long ago it was said that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so he is"; so, as a nation thinketh in its heart, so is it, and if we keep on poisoning the minds of the people to the point of believing that any step we may take will result in war we shall have done a fine job to bring about

war. Let us clear the atmosphere. Let each side admit its error.

I know in my own heart there will be no war. I have faith in the balanced judgment of America. I know of no Member of the House of Representatives or Senate, I know of no Cabinet member—and I have talked with them—I know of no labor union, of no business interest, I know of no father or mother, I know of no one who wants war; and I say "where there is a will there is a way," provided the mental processes of people are kept open and clean and straight. But get them into a condition such as Europe has been in time and time again, put them in such a state that something irrational may happen, and the result will be an irrational act.

I have heard much discussion here in the past week or 10 days as to what caused the last war. One of the causes of that war certainly was the condition of mind the people got into; there is no question that that acted upon the Congress, although, undoubtedly the Congress acted in good faith. But where do we stand now? We stand guard here in Congress.

I am not one who would attempt to say—no; I have not the right to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota what he should or should not say; but I do say that in any lawsuit there are certain facts that are relevant to the issue and in any debate there are certain facts that are relevant to the issue, and when I see in such a debate as this, Senators obscuring the issue by smearing some faction, race, group, or people, I fear they are lighting the fires of passion so that irrationality may operate and one cannot think straight.

As one of the few neutrals in this debate, permit me to observe that it is a queer thing to hear both sides on this discussion speaking almost exclusively to adherents on their own side. While the Senator from Minnesota is speaking scarcely anyone on the opposite side is present. When the opposition talks very few on this side are present. So we give the impression that we are talking and debating to convince each other. Is it possible that the underlying idea is to feed buncombe to the people for home consumption, yes, and get them so that they cannot think straight? [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER rapped with his gavel.

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I will yield in a moment. I wish to say to the able Senator from Wisconsin that I shall not try to direct the current of his debate when he comes to address the Senate. Let him then stand on the floor of the Senate, speaking in his own right and in his own time. I shall not try to impugn his motives or to reflect upon anything that he may say. But I shall hold him to his statement that he is going to vote against war and, if he votes for plunging America into war, he will have to deal with the junior Senator from Minnesota. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I have been very delighted to yield to Senators. The junior Senator from Kentucky desired to interrupt me a moment ago and I yield first to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the junior Senator from Minnesota will yield for just a moment, I should like to make a brief observation.

It is not my purpose to speak on this joint resolution. I have been here less than a week; and I have become convinced that there are Senators on both sides who throughout the years have carefully studied this matter and who know much more about it and can make a much greater contribution to the thought of the Senate and the people of the country than I am able to make, but this observation I do want to make:

This morning there was circulated in the Senate a questionnaire asking how many sons each Senator had who would be eligible to go to war in the event war should come and asking what the situation would be with regard to a Senator.



Mr. President, I have two sons, one 5 and one 10 years of age; but I also have the honor of holding a captain's commission in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States. Since I have been here I have not heard a single Senator suggest, in any way, that he would vote to put this country into war. The arguments I have heard have convinced me that the present law is favorable to Germany. We have lived for years on friendly terms with the possessions of Great Britain on this side of the Atlantic. No country has been able to live upon friendly terms with Mr. Hitler. I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota, however, that he may stand me by the side of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; that I will never vote, as a Member of the Senate, to send the boys of America to fight anybody's European war. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am delighted to know that. I take the Senator's hand on that. That seals it, and I will hold the able Senator to his statement; now I have at least two votes against sending our boys into a second world war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. Time and time again during this debate the Chair has warned the occupants of the galleries against demonstrations. Those demonstrations have been impartial. They have been on one side and on the other. I insist, however, that our guests in the galleries maintain the order they are expected to maintain, and observe the rules of the Senate. After all, we are not engaged in a political mass meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point made by the Senator from Kentucky is well taken. The Chair will state to our guests in the galleries that the rules of the Senate forbid any demonstrations of approval or disapproval of anything which takes place upon the floor of the Senate. Our guests will, therefore, observe the rules of the Senate by making no demonstrations of any kind.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, I am glad to know that my remarks this afternoon may have occasioned some exchange of opinions here, and that we have two pledges by able Senators that they are going to vote against war. I am going to take note of those pledges, and hope others may join the Senators who gave them.

#### RESOURCES OF WEALTH OF THE FRENCH EMPIRE

It had been my purpose to read most of the material I have here, but the very able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] desires to address the Senate, and I do not wish to consume the entire afternoon. For that reason I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, selected economic statistics for France and its colonial empire, in which are shown the production of wheat, rye, barley, iron ore, aluminum, petroleum, and so forth, of Algeria, Cameroons, French Equatorial Africa, French West Africa, Dahomey, French Guinea, French Sudan, the Ivory Coast, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Dakar, Madagascar and dependencies, Morocco, Reunion, Somali coast, Togo, Tunisia, French Guiana and Inini, Guadeloupe and dependencies, Martinique, St. Pierre and Miquelon, and other possessions of the French Empire, with all their great resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### SELECTED ECONOMIC STATISTICS FOR FRANCE AND ITS COLONIAL EMPIRE INTRODUCTORY NOTES

1. Sources of the following information and the abbreviations used to indicate them are as follows:

France. Bureau de la statistique générale. *Annuaire Statistique*. 1937. HA 1213 A4: A. S.

League of Nations. *Statistical Yearbook*, 1938. HC 57 A19: L of N. International Institute of Agriculture. *International Yearbook of Agricultural Statistics*. 1937-38. HD 1429 A34: I. Y. B.

Statesman's Yearbook, 1938. JA 51 S7: S. Y. B.

2. Area and population figures are all taken from the *Annuaire Statistique*, 1937 edition.

3. Production figures are for 1937, unless otherwise indicated; in many instances they are estimates.

4. Quoted passages are from the Statesman's Yearbook, 1938.

5. Conversion values for units used:

One square kilometer=100 hectares=0.3861 square miles.

One hectare (ha.)=2.471 acres.

One hectoliter (liquid)=26.418 gallons.

One kilogram (kg.)=2.2046 pounds.

One metric ton=0.98421 long tons (1.1023 short tons).

One quintal (100 kg.)=220.463 pounds.

United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. *Foreign Commerce Yearbook*, 1937, pages 408-409.

International Institute of Agriculture. *International Yearbook of Agricultural Statistics*, 1937-38, page VI.

#### I. FRANCE

Area	55,098,556 hectares (550,985.6 sq. km.)
Population (1936)	41,907,056
Production:	
Wheat	69,002,000 quintals
Rye	7,405,000 do
Barley	9,962,000 do
Buckwheat (1936)	3,400,000 do
Oats	45,576,000 do
Malze	5,476,000 do
Potatoes	147,222,000 do
Sugar beet and beet for alcohol	76,548,000 do
Table grapes	1,649,000 do
Pears and apples for cider	24,658,000 do
Silk culture, total value	5,607,000 francs
Wines	51,375,000 hectoliters
Cider (1936)	28,679,000 do
Fisheries, value (1936)	891,772,000 francs
Livestock products, dressed carcasses (slaughter-houses and farms) 1936:	
Cattle	6,289,000 quintals
Calves	2,845,000 do
Pigs	6,919,000 do
Iron ore (metal content)	11,600,000 metric tons
Bauxite	688,200 do
Aluminum	34,500 do
Petroleum (crude)	71,000 do
Coal	44,319,000 do
Salt	2,337,000 do

Sources: A. S., pp. 8, 81, 82, and 95; I. Y. B., pp. 67-72; L. of N. pp. 132, 134, 137, 141, 150, 151.

#### II. POSSESSIONS IN AFRICA

Area	11,392,807 square kilometers
Population	39,596,000

Source: A. S., p. 259.

#### Algeria:

Area	2,204,834 square kilometers
Population	7,235,000
Production:	
Wheat	9,038,000 quintals
Barley	5,981,000 do
Oats	1,388,000 do
Malze	36,000 do
Potatoes	1,312,000 do
Tobacco	176,000 do
Wine	15,424,000 hectoliters
Alcohol (1936)	655,000 do
Olive oil (1937-38)	177,000 quintals
Wool (1936) (exports)	21,000 metric tons
Citrus fruits (1936-37)	928,000 quintals
Figs (dried, fresh) (1936-37)	868,000 do
Livestock slaughter, 1936:	
Cattle and calves	173,000 animals
Sheep and goats	1,052,000 do
Pigs	74,000 do
Coal	14,000 metric tons
Iron ore (metal content)	1,265,000 do
Lead ore (metal content)	4,600 do
Pyrites	39,000 do
Natural phosphates	631,000 do
Superphosphates of lime (1936)	51,000 do

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 77, 86-96, 102, 107, 116, 122, 134, 141, 146, 160, 162, 163; I. Y. B., p. 223.

#### Cameroons (mandated territory):

Area	422,000 square kilometers
Population	2,341,000
Production:	
Malze (1936)	342,000 quintals
Cocoa (1936-37) (exports)	265,000 do
Ground nuts (1936)	372,000 do
Palm oil (exports)	100,000 do
Tobacco (1936)	100,000 kilograms
Millet (1936)	2,900,000 quintals
Palm kernels (native woods) (1936)	443,000 do

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 92, 99, 115, 117, 156, 227, 333.

#### French Equatorial Africa (Chad, Gabun, Middle Congo, Ubangi-Shari):

Area	2,487,000 square kilometers
Population	3,423,000
Production:	
Malze (1935)	380,000 quintals
Coffee (1937-38)	18,000 do
Cottonseed (1935)	142,000 do
Ground nuts (1935)	170,000 do
Palm oil (1936) (exports)	54,000 do
Cotton (1935)	71,000 do
Tobacco (1935)	1,000,000 kilograms
Gold (exports)	659 do

The resources of French Equatorial Africa are quite undeveloped. There are about 300,000 square miles of tropical forest extending to the Gabun coast, containing many species of trees of industrial value. Wild rubber is the most important. Palm oil is produced to some extent. Coffee, cacao, and cotton are also cultivated. In the Chad Colony large numbers of cattle, sheep, asses, camels, horses, and ostriches are raised, but there are no facilities for export. Ivory is an important article of export. Copper, zinc, and lead are found.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 92, 98, 110, 115, 117, 119, 156; I. Y. B., p. 333; S. Y. B., pp. 950-951.

#### French West Africa:

Area.....	square kilometers..	4,701,575
Population.....	.....	14,702,000
Production:		
Gold exports.....	kilograms..	3,992
Millet and sorghum (average annual production).....	metric tons..	2,000,000
Rice (average annual production).....	metric tons..	400,000
Maize (average annual production).....	metric tons..	450,000
Manioc (average annual production).....	metric tons..	1,000,000
Ground nuts (average annual production).....	metric tons..	750,000
Palm kernels and palm oil (average annual production).....	metric tons..	120,000
Cocoa (average annual production).....	metric tons..	45,000

Source: A. S., pp. 259, 266, and 304.

#### Dahomey:

Area.....	square kilometers..	112,000
Population.....	.....	1,351,000
Production:		
Millet and sorghum (average annual production).....	metric tons..	30,000
Maize (average annual production).....	metric tons..	200,000
Manioc (average annual production).....	metric tons..	300,000
Palm kernels and palm oil (average annual production).....	metric tons..	90,000
Tobacco (1935).....	kilograms..	40,000

The natives are of pure Negro stock. \* \* \* They are industrious agriculturists in the coast region, and grow maize, manioc, and yams. \* \* \* The forests contain oil palms, which have been profitably utilized. These furnish the chief exports—kernels and oil. Cotton cultivation has recently been successfully introduced in the central provinces; coffee cultivation has given good results in the south provinces.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 304; I. Y. B., p. 333; S. Y. B., pp. 964-965.

#### French Guinea:

Area.....	square kilometers..	251,000
Population.....	.....	2,011,000
Production:		
Gold (1936).....	kilograms..	3,045
Rice (average annual production).....	metric tons..	180,000
Manioc (average annual production).....	metric tons..	100,000
Maize (average annual production).....	metric tons..	50,000

The principal products are palm oil and nuts, rubber, millet, earthnuts, rice, gum, bananas, pineapples, and coffee. \* \* \* There is an experimental garden at Camayenne near Conakry (the capital), where the culture of bananas, pineapples, rubber trees, and other plants is being tried.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 304; S. Y. B., p. 963.

#### French Sudan:

Area.....	square kilometers..	1,531,255
Population.....	.....	3,569,000
Production:		
Millet and sorghum (average annual production).....	metric tons..	450,000
Rice (average annual production).....	metric tons..	100,000
Maize (average annual production).....	metric tons..	70,000
Groundnuts (average annual production).....	metric tons..	100,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms..	1,500,000
Manioc (1936).....	quintals..	1,045,000

The natives cultivate groundnuts, millet, maize, rice, cotton, sesame; other products are rubber, gum arabic, and kariti.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 304; I. Y. B., pp. 220 and 333; S. Y. B., p. 965.

#### Ivory Coast:

Area.....	square kilometers..	477,135
Population.....	.....	3,850,000
Production:		
Millet and sorghum (average annual production).....	metric tons..	450,000

#### Ivory Coast—Continued.

##### Production—Continued.

Rice (average annual production).....	metric tons..	70,000
Maize (average annual production).....	metric tons..	100,000
Manioc (average annual production).....	metric tons..	300,000
Cocoa (average annual production).....	metric tons..	45,000
Tobacco (1935).....	kilograms..	40,000
Palm kernels.....	quintals..	107,000
Palm oil.....	do.....	41,000

The natives cultivate groundnuts, maize, rice, millet, bananas, pineapples, and many other fruits. They have also been taught to grow cocoa, the export of which increased from an average of 4 tons in 1904-8 to 43,565 tons in 1935. The cultivation of cotton is being developed; coconuts and rubber are collected. The mahogany forests inland are worked. Gold is found. \* \* \* Manganese deposits have also been located.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 304; I. Y. B., pp. 216 and 333; S. Y. B., p. 964.

#### Mauritania:

Area.....	square kilometers..	835,000
Population.....	.....	383,000
Production:		
Millet and sorghum (average annual production).....	metric tons..	40,000
Maize (average annual production).....	do.....	10,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms..	65,000

Chief products are cattle, gum, and salt. In 1936 there were 65,230 camels, 220,486 cattle, 61,427 asses, and 1,646,848 sheep.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 304; I. Y. B., p. 333; S. Y. B., p. 966.

#### Niger:

Area.....	square kilometers..	1,293,810
Population.....	.....	1,747,000
Production:		
Millet and sorghum (average annual production).....	metric tons..	600,000
Manioc (average annual production).....	metric tons..	150,000
Groundnuts (average annual production).....	metric tons..	20,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms..	650,000

The country is composed of a zone in the north, which is largely desolate country; a central strip, which is wooded; and the southern zone, richly wooded and abounding in cattle.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 304; I. Y. B., p. 333; S. Y. B., p. 966.

#### Sénégal and Dakar:

Area.....	square kilometers..	201,375
Population.....	.....	1,791,000
Production:		
Maize (Sénégal, 1936).....	quintals..	164,000
Dakar and Sénégal (average annual production):		
Millet and sorghum.....	metric tons..	400,000
Rice.....	do.....	50,000
Manioc.....	do.....	120,000
Groundnuts.....	do.....	550,000

The natives cultivate groundnuts (production, 1935, 580,000 tons), millet, maize, and some rice; other products are castor beans, some coconuts, gum from Mauritania, and rubber from the Casamance River. Groundnuts form the bulk of the exports. A salt industry is being developed. Native industries comprise weaving, pottery, brickmaking, and jewelry; a small quantity of gold and titanium-bearing sand is produced.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 304; I. Y. B., p. 219; S. Y. B., p. 962.

#### Madagascar and dependencies:

Area.....	square kilometers..	942,200
Population (not including dependencies).....	.....	3,798,000
Production:		
Livestock slaughter:		
Cattle.....	animals..	535,000
Pigs.....	do.....	112,000
Maize (1936).....	quintals..	1,050,000
Rice (1936).....	do.....	6,800,000
Potatoes (1936).....	do.....	360,000
Coffee (1936).....	do.....	280,000
Cane sugar (1936).....	do.....	110,000
Tobacco (1936).....	do.....	64,000
Alcohol (1936).....	hectoliters..	11,000
Copra (1936).....	quintals..	200,000
Groundnuts (1936).....	do.....	64,000
Gold (estimated).....	kilograms..	419

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 77, 107, and 156; I. Y. B., p. 234.

#### Morocco:

Area.....	square kilometers..	398,627
Population.....	.....	6,296,000
Production:		
Wheat.....	quintals..	5,687,000
Barley.....	do.....	8,261,000
Oats.....	do.....	395,000
Maize.....	do.....	1,615,000
Wine.....	hectoliters..	532,000



## Morocco—Continued.

## Production—Continued.

Wool (1936).....	metric tons.....	18,500
Olives for oil (1936).....	quintals.....	550,000
Livestock slaughter (18 towns):		
Cattle and calves.....	animals.....	357,000
Sheep and goats.....	do.....	1,624,000
Pigs.....	do.....	26,000
Sea fisheries.....	metric tons.....	30,700
Coal.....	do.....	107,000
Manganese ore (metal content).....	do.....	34,000
Molybdenum ore (metal content).....	do.....	196
Lead ore (metal content).....	do.....	14,000
Antimony ore (metal content).....	do.....	44
Natural phosphates.....	do.....	1,479,000
Superphosphates of lime.....	do.....	30,000

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 77, 82, 86, 88, 91, 92, 106, 122, 134, 138, 139, 146, 154, 162, and 163; I. Y. B., p. 237.

## Reunion:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	2,511
Population.....	do.....	209,000
Production:		
Cane sugar (1937-38).....	quintals.....	850,000

The chief productions are sugar (62,000 acres), rum, manioc (12,000 acres), tapioca, vanilla, essences. The forests occupy about 150,000 acres.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., p. 101; S. Y. B., p. 957.

## Somali coast:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	21,700
Population.....	do.....	46,000
Production:		
Salt (1936).....	metric tons.....	22,000

The country has scarcely any industries, but with the coast fisheries and inland trade there is considerable traffic. The mineral wealth of the country is imperfectly known. Salt has been mined since 1912 \* \* \* other minerals supposed to exist are: Gypsum, mica, amethyst, sulphur, and petrol \* \* \*.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., p. 136; S. Y. B., p. 959.

## Togo (mandated territory):

Area.....	square kilometers.....	56,500
Population.....	do.....	739,000
Production:		
Cocoa (1936-37).....	quintals.....	25,000
Copra (exports).....	do.....	30,000
Ground nuts (1936).....	do.....	60,000
Palm oil (exports).....	do.....	17,000
Cotton (1935-36).....	do.....	15,000
Coffee (1935-36) (exports).....	do.....	163,744
Maize (1935-36).....	do.....	500,000

There is no mining by Europeans, but the natives in the Sokodé and Klouto districts smelt iron, in which this colony is very rich.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 99, 114, 115, and 117; I. Y. B., pp. 357 and 275; S. Y. B., p. 967.

## Tunisia (protectorate):

Area.....	square kilometers.....	155,830
Population.....	do.....	2,608,000
Production:		
Wheat.....	quintals.....	4,800,000
Barley.....	do.....	2,000,000
Oats.....	do.....	285,000
Maize.....	do.....	60,000
Wine.....	hectoliters.....	1,454,000
Alcohol.....	do.....	19,000
Olive oil (1937-38).....	quintals.....	500,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms.....	717,000
Livestock slaughter (1933):		
Cattle.....	animals.....	91,000
Sheep and goats.....	do.....	782,000
Iron ore (metal content).....	metric tons.....	480,000
Lead ore (metal content).....	do.....	12,900
Natural phosphates.....	do.....	1,771,000
Superphosphates of lime.....	do.....	44,000

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 77, 86, 88, 91, 92, 106, 107, 116, 141, 146, 162, and 163; I. Y. B., p. 333.

## III. POSSESSIONS IN AMERICA

Area.....	square kilometers.....	94,126
Population.....	do.....	592,000
Source: A. S., p. 259.		

## French Guiana and Inini:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	91,000
Population.....	do.....	37,000
Production: Gold (1936).....	kilograms.....	1,417

The country has immense forests rich in many kinds of timber. There is little agriculture in the colony; only about 7,900 acres are under cultivation. The crops consist of rice, maize, manioc, cocoa, bananas, and sugarcane. The most important industry is gold mining (placer). The exports consist of cocoa, bananas, various woods, gold fish, fish glue, rum, rosewood essence, balata, and hides. (Guiana.)

The principal products are rosewood and cabinet wood. Gold is also found. (Territory of Inini.)

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., p. 156; S. Y. B., pp. 970, 971.

## Guadeloupe and dependencies:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	1,780
Population.....	do.....	304,000
Production:		
Coffee (1936-37 exports).....	quintals.....	4,000
Cane sugar (1934-35).....	do.....	460,000

Chief products are sugar, bananas, coffee, cocoa, and rum. For local consumption there are grown sweetpotatoes, manioc, tobacco, Indian corn, and vegetables.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., p. 98 and 101; S. Y. B., p. 969-70.

## Martinique:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	1,106
Population.....	do.....	247,000
Production:		
Cane sugar (1937-38).....	quintals.....	515,000
Cocoa (1935-36) (exports).....	do.....	1,000

Sugar and rum are the chief productions, then come cocoa, pineapple, bananas, and coffee.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., p. 99 and 101; S. Y. B., p. 971.

## St. Pierre and Miquelon:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	240
Population.....	do.....	4,000
Production:		

The islands, being mostly barren rock, are unsuited for agriculture. The chief industry is cod fishing.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; S. Y. B., p. 972.

## IV. POSSESSIONS IN ASIA

Area.....	square kilometers.....	943,377
Population (1936).....	do.....	26,753,000
Source: A. S., p. 259.		

## Cheik-Said:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	1,622
Population.....	do.....	1,000
Production: No production figures found.		

Source: A. S., p. 259.

## French India:

Area.....	square kilometers.....	513
Population.....	do.....	299,000
Production:		
Rice (1936-37).....	quintals.....	237,000
Cotton, ginned (1936-37).....	do.....	1,000

The principal crops are paddy, rice, manioc, groundnuts. On December 31, 1936, there were 59,717 cattle, 24,300 sheep, and 33,505 goats. There are at Pondichéry 3 cotton mills, and at Chandernagor 1 jute mill; the cotton mills have, in all, 1,960 looms and 84,744 spindles, employing 7,600 persons. There are also at work a few oil presses for groundnuts, and 1 ice factory. Two bone mills have also recently been established in Pondichéry.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; I. Y. B., pp. 279 and 355; S. Y. B., pp. 925-926.

## Indochina (Annam, Cambodia, Cochinchina, Laos, Tonking):

Area.....	square kilometers.....	740,400
Population.....	do.....	23,030,000
Production:		
Rice (average annual production).....	quintals.....	63,000,000
Rubber (average annual production).....	metric tons.....	50,000
Tea (1936) (average annual production).....	quintals.....	119,000
Alcohol (average annual production).....	hectoliters.....	391,000
Cotton, ginned (1936) (average annual production).....	quintals.....	13,000
Coffee (1937-38) (average annual production).....	quintals.....	18,000
Tobacco (1936) (average annual production).....	kilograms.....	14,293,000
Raw silk (estimated annual production).....	metric tons.....	200
Sugarcane (1936-37).....	quintals.....	9,226,000
Maize (1936).....	do.....	4,596,000
Coal.....	metric tons.....	2,265,000
Zinc ore (metal content).....	do.....	5,000
Tin ore (metal content).....	do.....	1,600,000
Tungsten ore (metal content) (exports).....	metric tons.....	493,000
Phosphates of lime (metal content).....	metric tons.....	493,000
Gold ore (metal content).....	kilograms.....	182

Sources: A. S., pp. 259, 297, and 266; L. of N., pp. 103, 107, 119, and footnote, 124; I. Y. B., pp. 275, 295, 329, and 331.

## Annam (protectorate):

Area.....	square kilometers.....	147,600
Population.....	do.....	5,656,000
Production:		
Rice (average annual production).....	quintals.....	9,000,000
Rubber (including production in Laos).....	metric tons.....	300
Sugarcane (1936-37).....	quintals.....	5,500,000
Coffee (1936).....	do.....	13,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms.....	3,300,000

## Annam (protectorate)—Continued.

## Production—Continued.

## Ground nuts (1936) (unshelled nuts)

Tea (1936).....	quintals..	90,000
Mulberry (1936).....	kilograms..	9,000,000
	quintals..	140,000

Rice is the most important product. Others are cotton, maize, and other cereals, the areca nut, mulberry, cinnamon, tobacco, sugar, betel, manioc, bamboo; excellent timber abounds, also caoutchouc, cardamoms, coffee, dye, and medicinal plants. Raw silk is produced. There are about 900,000 head of cattle in Annam, and cattle rearing is of some importance. There is a gold mine at Bông-Miêu in the Province of Quangnam, worked by a French company. Copper, zinc, coal, and iron ore are also found in various districts. In north, central, and southern Annam there are salt works.

Sources: A. S., p. 259 and 297; I. Y. B., pp. 295, 325, 329, 331, 339, and 359; S. Y. B., p. 929.

## Cambodia (protectorate):

Area.....	square kilometers..	181,000
Population.....		3,046,000
Production:		
Rice (average annual production).....	quintals..	8,000,000
Rubber.....	metric tons..	13,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms..	5,700,000
Ground nuts (1936) (unshelled nuts)		
	quintals..	33,000

The chief product of Cambodia is rice which is exported by way of Cholon where the rice is milled, and Saigon where it is shipped. Amongst the other products are tobacco, kapok, cotton, pepper, maize, palm sugar, rubber, and silk. Pepper is especially grown in the Provinces of Kampot and Takéo. \* \* \* Maize growing is extending. \* \* \* Cattle breeding is a flourishing native industry. \* \* \* Other native industries are: Weaving of silk and cotton, pottery, and making of rush mats. \* \* \* Valuable forests cover an area of about 20,000,000 acres. Phosphate is the principal mineral, but not worked very extensively. There are also precious stones and jet workings.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 297; I. Y. B., pp. 331 and 339; S. Y. B., p. 930.

## Cochinchina:

Area.....	square kilometers..	64,700
Population.....		4,616,000
Production:		
Rice (average annual production).....	quintals..	27,000,000
Rubber.....	metric tons..	36,700
Sugarcane (1936-37).....	quintals..	2,800,000
Coffee.....	do.....	18,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms..	3,620,000
Groundnuts (1936) (unshelled nuts)		
	quintals..	17,000
Tea (1936).....	kilograms..	224,000
Mulberry (1936).....	quintals..	6,000

The chief culture is rice. \* \* \* Other crops are maize, beans, sweetpotatoes, earth nuts, cotton, rubber, sugarcane, tobacco, coffee, coconuts, betelnuts, pepper, oranges, bananas, etc. The farm animals in 1933 comprised 11,426 horses, 454,968 buffaloes, 628,520 pigs, 5,772 sheep and goats.

River and coast fishing is actively carried on; the fishery products are valued at 63,350,000 francs yearly.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 297; I. Y. B., pp. 295, 325, 329, 339, and 359; S. Y. B., p. 928.

## Laos:

Area.....	square kilometers..	231,400
Population.....		1,012,000
Production:		
Rice (average annual production).....	quintals..	3,000,000
(Rubber included with Annam.)		
Sugarcane (1936-37).....	do.....	2,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms..	272,000
Mulberry (1936).....	quintals..	2,000

The soil is fertile, producing rice (output in 1936, about 218,000 tons), cotton, indigo, tobacco, benzoin, cardamon, sticklac and fruits, and bearing teak forests, from which the logs are now floated down the Mékong to Saigon; cattle rearing is also of some importance. Gold, tin, lead, and precious stones are found, and concessions have been granted to several French mining companies.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 297; I. Y. B., pp. 295, 331, and 359; S. Y. B., p. 931.

## Tonking:

Area.....	square kilometers..	115,700
Population.....		8,700,000
Production:		
Rice (average annual production).....	quintals..	16,000,000
Tea (1936).....	kilograms..	1,740,000
Sugarcane (1936-37).....	quintals..	924,000
Coffee.....	do.....	9,000
Tobacco (1936).....	kilograms..	1,401,000
Groundnuts (1936) (unshelled nuts)		
	quintals..	13,000

Other products are maize, arrowroot, sugarcane, coffee, tea, various fruit trees, and tobacco. A large quantity of raw silk is produced annually, most of which is used in native weaving and the remainder exported. There are rich limestone quarries, calamine and tin mines, and also rich hard-coal beds.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 297; I. Y. B., pp. 295, 325, 329, 331, and 339; S. Y. B., pp. 931.

## Kwang-Chau-Wan (leased territory):

Area.....	square kilometers..	842
Population.....		206,000

Production: " \* \* \* the exports are straw sacks, swine, cattle, brown sugar, groundnuts, and firecrackers."

Sources: A. S., p. 259; S. Y. B., p. 932.

## Syria and Lebanon (mandated territories):

Area.....	square kilometers..	200,000
Population.....		3,217,000

## Production:

Wheat.....	quintals..	4,688,450
Barley.....	do.....	2,664,360
Sorghum and millet.....	do.....	946,900
Lentils.....	do.....	282,958
Potatoes.....	quintals..	1,195,600
Grapes.....	do.....	1,799,030
Melons.....	do.....	1,868,280
Citrus fruit.....	do.....	549,820
Maize.....	do.....	271,700
Olives.....	do.....	918,105
Wine.....	hectoliters..	80,000
Cottonseed.....	quintals..	121,000
Cotton.....	do.....	57,000
Wool.....	metric tons..	6,800
Rice (1937-38).....	quintals..	37,000
Sugarcane (1936-37).....	do.....	44,000
Raisins.....	do.....	108,000
Tobacco.....	kilograms..	3,446,000

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 292; L. of N., pp. 106, 110, 119, and 122; I. Y. B., pp. 279, 295, 312, and 331.

## V. POSSESSIONS IN OCEANIA

Area.....	square kilometers..	34,651
Population.....		147,000

Source: A. S., p. 259.

## French establishments in Oceania:

Area.....	square kilometers..	3,998
Population.....		44,000
Production:		
Copra (1936) (exports).....	quintals..	221,000
Sugarcane (1936-37).....	do.....	15,000
Tobacco (1935).....	kilograms..	3,000
Phosphates of lime (Oceania) (1936)		
	metric tons..	147,000

The most important of the islands is Tahiti \* \* \*. Pearls and mother-of-pearl are important products. The island is mountainous and picturesque, with a fertile coastland bearing coconut, banana, and orange trees, sugarcane, vanilla, and other tropical fruits, besides vegetables grown in temperate climates \* \* \*.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 266; L. of N., p. 114; I. Y. B., pp. 295 and 333; S. Y. B., p. 975.

## New Caledonia and dependencies:

Area.....	square kilometers..	18,653
Population.....		53,000
Production:		
Coffee (1936-37) (exports).....	quintals..	14,000
Copra (1936) (exports).....	do.....	28,000
Maize (1936-37).....	do.....	14,000
Potatoes (1936).....	do.....	6,000
Nickel (metal content) (1936).....	metric tons..	4,900
Chrome (metal content) (1936).....	do.....	13,900

Of the total area one-third is not cultivable; about 1,600 square miles are pasture land; about the same area is cultivated or cultivable; and about 500 square miles contain forest which is being worked. \* \* \* The chief agricultural products are coffee, copra, cotton, manioc (cassava), maize, tobacco, bananas, pineapples. The mineral resources are very great; chrome, cobalt, nickel, iron, and manganese abound; antimony, mercury, cinnabar, silver, gold, lead, and copper have all been obtained. The nickel deposits are of special value, being without arsenic.

Sources: A. S., pp. 259 and 266; L. of N., pp. 98 and 114; I. Y. B., pp. 277 and 285; S. Y. B., p. 973.

## New Hebrides (condominium with Great Britain):

Area.....	square kilometers..	12,000
Population.....		50,000
Production:		
Coffee (1936-37) (exports).....	quintals..	3,000
Cocoa (1935-36) (exports).....	do.....	9,000
Copra (1936) (exports).....	do.....	106,000

Maize, coffee, cotton, cocoa, vanilla, and coconuts are grown and are the chief articles of export. In some places sulfur is abundant.

Sources: A. S., p. 259; L. of N., pp. 98, 99, and 114; S. Y. B., p. 974.



## Recapitulation of area and population figures

	Area (square kilometers)	Population
France.....	550,985.6	41,907,056
Possessions in Africa.....	11,392,807.0	39,596,000
Possessions in America.....	94,126.0	592,000
Possessions in Asia.....	943,377.0	126,753,000
Possessions in Oceania.....	34,651.0	147,000
Total.....	<sup>2</sup> 13,015,946.6	<sup>2</sup> 108,995,056

<sup>1</sup> 1936.<sup>2</sup> Totals computed from figures given.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I say, however, that even in that list Senators will not find certain possessions which I had asked to have included, and which I hope to present at some other time.

At this point in my remarks, in order that I may not take too much time, I will include the statement of George Bancroft relating to Andrew Jackson and the French spoliation claims, in which he goes into the foreign situation.

I also wish to insert in the RECORD a statement from the Denver Post of February 19, 1938, in which the able Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] suggests that the foreign debts be paid in certain commodities which this country does not have.

I presume there will be no objection to putting that matter in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

## STATEMENT OF GEORGE BANCROFT RELATING TO ANDREW JACKSON AND THE FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS

(Extract from Fourth of July oration at Springfield, Mass.) before the democracy of Springfield and neighboring towns, July 4, 1836, pp. 26-27 (Springfield, Mass., 1836. AC901.W3)

Democracy has washed out the spot that European insolence had cast on our flag; she has caught the dying echoes of the wrongs of our mariners in years long gone by; she has knocked at the palace gates of the oldest principalities of Europe and demanded redress for American seamen; she has gone into the heart of the maritime state of Denmark and claimed and obtained reparation; she has crossed the mountains of Spain, when their fastness rung with the tumult of domestic feuds, and, raising her voice louder than the jarring discords of civil factions, has hushed the scene of turbulence into concession and redress; she has sent her messengers into the beautiful bay of Naples, and her fleets, wafted by the bland zephyrs that raise but a ripple for a surge to break upon the flowery beach, have waked the younger branch of the Bourbons from their oblivion, and commanded requital to be made for every ancient wrong. She has brushed away the dust from her slumbering claims against France, and bearing the American pennant into the halls of the Tuilleries, she calmly claimed the reparation of injury from an ancient ally and a friend; and when the reparation, though acknowledged to be due, was yet withheld, she left the union flag all spangled with stars in proud defiance on the walls of the palace, where it hung in terror till the world turned its finger of scorn on the kingdom that delayed the fulfillment of an obligation which it did not dare to question. And has democracy offered an apology for the expression of truth and the performance of duty?

The indemnity is to be paid; and there have been no apologies, unless it be apologies from men whose shortsighted policy would protect their gains by the sacrifice of honor. Thus it was that the governments of Europe have been compelled to restore more than eight millions of money of which our merchants had been defrauded. Nor is this the noblest part of the result. It is a glorious testimony to the advancement of humanity. The redress of wrongs was entrusted to reason, and on the theater of European ambition and violence, the furies and licentiousness of war were made to yield to the language of remonstrance and the progress of intelligence. Well was it said on the floor of Congress that the President, in his policy, "would carry the people along with him." Well did a son of Massachusetts give a pledge for us and say, "I engage for New England." New England speaks for herself and joins in the applause of the world; she has reconciled herself to democracy; its triumphs are her own."

NOTE.—Jackson was President from 1829 to 1837.

[From the Denver Post of February 19, 1938]

SENATOR ASKS EUROPE TO PAY UNITED STATES IN PRODUCE—SCHWELLENBACH THINKS DEBT QUESTION CAN BE SETTLED THAT WAY

WASHINGTON, February 19.—Senator SCHWELLENBACH (Democrat) of Washington suggested Saturday that the countries which owe the United States pay the debts in produce.

Making it plain that he opposed any scaling down of the debts, SCHWELLENBACH said he thought some method might be worked out

by which a debtor could ship in commodities this country needs but does not have.

Senator NORRIS (Independent) of Nebraska said, however, that he would oppose any debt settlement by indirect methods.

He said also, that he would not look with favor on any attempt to link debt settlement to trade agreements.

Some congressional leaders said there had been informal discussion of proposals that debtor nations lower their tariffs to spur their imports of this country's surplus agricultural products, charging off from their war debts the difference in what they might have collected in tariffs.

Senator BORAH (Republican) of Idaho said he was against any compromise. Senator LA FOLLETTE (Progressive) of Wisconsin opposed any proposal to scale down debts, but Senator CAPPER (Republican) of Kansas said he would like to see the whole matter settled finally.

Congressional discussion of the debts was inspired by reports that Hungary had proposed a scaled down settlement. The little country's debt is only \$2,000,000.

The proposal was discussed by President Roosevelt and congressional leaders Thursday. The latter were represented as feeling that acceptance of the proposal would set an unwelcome precedent.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some statements made in the Senate by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] concerning the collection of foreign debts owed the United States, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

## COLLECTION OF FOREIGN DEBTS OWED THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like at this time to call the attention of my colleagues and of the Nation to a bad memory, to one of our semiannual black-letter days, which has just passed and the great powers now playing in the international poker game "passed" with it, save only the little country of Finland. I am referring to June 15, the date on which our defaulting European debtors dodged again, and only an ever dwindling few were polite enough to notify us that they were not going to pay. The Japanese are not the only ones who say, "So sorry, excuse please!"

I think it is time that we here in the Senate, always talking about new taxes, new relief bills, new spending, talk about collecting a few billion dollars in behalf of the American taxpayer. I believe the Americans who pay taxes want us to collect these debts. After all, if these debts were paid, our staggering national debt could be retired.

There has recently been agitation to lift the present limit of \$45,000,000,000. If our war debts were collected, we would not have to worry about that limit. The collections could retire thirteen billions in outstanding Federal bonds. Nearly half of those bonds were floated in the dark days of the World War, to raise in America the money from Americans to finance Europe's family quarrel, to save the world for the franc, the pound, and the lira.

Mr. President, I can say that the American citizen everywhere wants us to collect. Just the other day, riding to the Capitol in a taxi, the driver, a war veteran, incidentally, was talking about the visit of the King and Queen of England. He thought the visit was a nice gesture, good for friendship, but he went on to say, "I think England ought to pay its war debt, or at least pay the interest on it. I think all those nations that owe us money ought to pay it. I have to pay my bills; why shouldn't they? I think that if the King had announced over here that England intended to pay her war debt, the good done by his visit would have been a thousand times bigger. They borrowed the money; they owe the money. We ought to be paid."

That was a taxi driver's interest in war debts. He spoke as a plain American citizen, earning his living by rolling a cab around the streets of Washington. But he is a taxpayer, and he has every right to demand that the American Government collect something for the taxpayers as well as from them.

I am sure all my colleagues would join me in the Senate in cutting our taxes if we could. God knows we do not like to be raising them. If we collected those war debts we could cut our taxes. We could take some of the load off business. We could take some of the burden off the farmer, the workingman, the little storekeeper, who pays taxes.

I understand there is considerable talk now about lowering the exemption on income taxes so as to make more people pay taxes. In other words, we will have no mercy on our own people, just dip right down into their pockets as deeply as we can get and take all we can find. And we will be dipping down for a lot of it, because we are so generous with \$13,000,000,000 these great big nations owe us, which they will not pay. All that Europe wants to send us is refugees. So we get ready to soak our own folks to save somebody else. Big-hearted Uncle Sam! They want to pay us in immigrants, who would take the jobs of Americans; they want to make an initial "payment" to us of 20,000 refugees.

I am not surprised that many taxpayers are disgusted. I am, too. Any such treatment as this looks like asking America to finance the world as well as feed its refugees. They will not pay, but they wish to send their refugees here for us to feed. Why cannot England, France, Russia, Germany, Italy, Poland, and the other nations pay us at least something on account? They have

plenty of money with which to buy battleships, to build airplanes, to manufacture cannon, and to stack up rifles.

Mr. President, what would you think of a friend of yours who was so sick he was almost dead and who borrowed a hundred dollars of you and then, when it was time to pay it back, said, "Bill Smith has been saying nasty things about me, so I'm going out to buy a rifle and I can't pay you; you'll just have to wait"? That is, more or less, exactly what has been done to all of us by these friends who were dying until we gave them a transfusion of men and money. Now that they are feeling chipper and cocky again, strutting their armies up and down Europe, the doctor can go to a climate even warmer than we are experiencing in Washington at the present time outside of this air-conditioned Chamber.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. May I say to my friend, the able Senator from North Carolina, that we must remember that we expended this money to make the world safe for democracy? Should we not forgive them then?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator in answer to that question that we were led into the war under the guise that we were going to save democracy, and stop anarchy, and stop war for all time.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The distinguished Senator will no doubt bear me out in the statement that we were successful in that respect, were we not?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We were not at all successful in that, and, if the Senator will pardon me, I will say that, as a matter of fact, since the last World War ended November 11, 1918, more than 3,000,000 persons have been killed in battle in Spain, in Ethiopia, and in China.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Then we did not succeed in saving the world? And we did not put an end to all wars? Can that be possible? Were we not the invincible crusaders led on by Woodrow the Great?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course not; and as for saving Christianity, the Senator certainly knows that more temples of worship have been razed to the ground and destroyed and more Christian people have been murdered than at any other time within the past 50 years prior to the breaking out of the World War in August of 1914.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to ask the Senator, is there not more democracy in the world now than there was in 1917, or is it possible that there is less democracy and can we really believe the scoundrels who boasted "He kept us out of war"; only to betray us into war?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That depends upon what is considered to be democracy. Since the revolution in Russia, which, according to my recollection, broke out about 1917, the 160,000,000 to 180,000,000 people constituting the population of Soviet Russia claim that their country is a democracy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. May I inquire of the Senator whether the Senator considers the British Empire and the French Empire to be democracies?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In a sense I consider Great Britain to be an imperialistic democracy. I consider France to be a socialistic democracy.

The Senator will recall that the Prime Minister of France or the War Minister—I believe one man holds both offices—recently was declared a virtual dictator of the Republic of France.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the Senator will permit, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point in his remarks a short statement as to the so-called democracies of Britain and France—a statement which I made on the floor of the Senate some weeks back, and also a definition of Britain's form of government by Sir Anthony Eden.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should be very much indebted to the Senator from Minnesota if he would do so. I thank the Senator very much for his very excellent contribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement referred to by the Senator from Minnesota may be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

"PREDATORY DEMOCRACIES

"It seems to me that the nations which are referred to as democracies are empires—world-wide, far-flung empires. France is an empire. That Empire has been won by conquest and aggression. The swords of the French imperialists are dripping with blood. They have acquired their territory by aggression. That empire extends into Asia, Africa, and America. It is not European alone; it is world-wide. France is an empire won by aggression and war, and everyone knows it or should know it.

"The far-flung Empire of Britain, scattered over one-third of this mighty earth, upon which the sun never sets, was won by aggression and war. It was won by bloodshed, won by swords dipped into the blood of nations now enslaved by that Empire; and yet we hear Senators and Representatives talk about defending these democracies! If that be democracy, God save the world!

"We have a democracy here. Let us save that democracy. Let us attend to our own affairs and preserve and protect our own people, including our 12,000,000 unemployed.

"If we enter another destructive world war, democracy may disappear from the earth. We may scrap our own institutions. We may ruin the work that our fathers and founders laid down in this country, which they have bequeathed to us, which it is our sacred duty to uphold, and which we are sworn to uphold.

"I am weary of hearing about defending democracies which are nothing but bloody, aggressive empires, which hold hundreds of millions of enslaved people under their imperial rule. We are still nursing our wounds from the last war 'to save the world for democracy.' We are still trying feebly to collect billions of unpaid

war debts which the debtors solemnly promised to pay, but never paid; and yet they have the nerve to come over here to us now and ask us again to defend their democracies—democracies, indeed!

"THE STATE OF BRITISH DEMOCRACY IN 1928

"We have not got democratic government today. We never had it, and I venture to suggest to honorable members opposite that we shall never have it. What we have done in all the progress of reform and evolution of politics is to broaden the basis of oligarchy."—Anthony Eden.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to place bouquets where they deserve to be placed. I wish to say that I consider my friend and colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], who has been so kind as to contribute to the few words I had to say upon this subject, to be one of America's greatest patriots, and I wish that all America could hear me say that, because I know of no man in this body who is more thoroughly interested in the American taxpayers and in the future of America than is the distinguished Senator from the great Commonwealth of Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wish to thank the Senator from North Carolina for that statement, for I have vivid recollections of a time when I was called something other than a patriot.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I recall that once upon a time when the Senator was a Member of the House of Representatives he had the courage of his convictions and voted against America's entering the war to save the world for democracy, and to save Christianity, and to stop all war, and when he returned to his State he was threatened with lynching, and people wanted to run him out of town; but later they returned him to the Senate as Minnesota's hero, and I am glad they returned him because the American people have in this body a 100-percent patriotic and courageous citizen.

Mr. President, even though my colleagues are aware of the exact amounts owed by these defaulters—and I apologize to them for taking up their time, for I know that they are more thoroughly familiar with this subject than I am—I want the American people to know just who owes and how much. Then they will know how to answer the war makers and gossip-mongers of Europe when they come around again with their little cup begging for help. As certain as it is that we are here today, they will be coming around with their little cups begging again for our money and our men.

I have before me a statement which some months ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when I was speaking upon this same subject upon the floor of the Senate. The statement shows the total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States as of January 31, 1938. I ask that the statement be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Statement showing total indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States, Jan. 31, 1938

Country	Total indebtedness	Principal unpaid	Interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements	Interest accrued and unpaid under funding and moratorium agreements
<b>Funded debts:</b>				
Austria.....	\$26,005,480.99	\$25,980,480.66	.....	\$25,000.33
Belgium.....	440,576,360.97	400,680,000.00	.....	36,146,360.97
Czechoslovakia.....	165,658,603.61	165,241,108.90	\$3,750,000.00	417,494.71
Estonia.....	18,039,718.13	16,466,012.87	492,360.19	1,081,345.07
Finland.....	8,350,481.00	8,198,489.98	151,991.02	.....
France.....	4,121,120,502.59	3,863,650,000.00	38,636,500.00	218,834,002.59
Great Britain.....	5,263,719,066.73	4,368,000,000.00	131,520,000.00	764,199,066.73
Greece.....	33,868,484.24	31,516,000.00	449,080.00	1,903,404.24
Hungary.....	2,316,268.35	1,908,560.00	57,072.75	350,635.60
Italy.....	2,019,907,055.68	2,004,900,000.00	2,506,125.00	12,500,930.68
Latvia.....	8,300,896.27	6,879,464.20	205,989.96	1,215,442.11
Lithuania.....	7,429,514.65	6,197,682.00	185,930.46	1,045,932.19
Poland.....	252,159,819.66	206,057,000.00	6,161,835.00	39,940,984.66
Rumania.....	63,971,892.36	63,860,560.43	.....	111,331.93
Yugoslavia.....	61,663,515.63	61,625,000.00	.....	38,515.63
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>12,493,087,660.86</b>	<b>11,231,160,359.04</b>	<b>184,116,884.38</b>	<b>1,077,810,417.44</b>
<b>Unfunded debts:</b>				
Armenia.....	22,705,400.00	11,959,917.49	.....	10,745,482.51
Nicaragua.....	487,544.98	289,898.78	.....	197,646.20
Russia.....	375,742,114.78	192,601,297.37	.....	183,140,817.41
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>398,935,059.76</b>	<b>204,851,113.64</b>	.....	<b>194,083,946.12</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>12,892,022,720.62</b>	<b>11,436,011,472.68</b>	<b>184,116,884.38</b>	<b>1,271,894,363.56</b>

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the statement was secured by me from the Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C. It shows the indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States as of January 1938. I may add that since the statement was made, Finland has paid on account of the above amount \$232,935.50, and Hungary has also reduced her debt as shown on the table by the sum of \$9,828.16. That is a small amount, but it is something. It is better than nothing. The indebtedness of Germany is not shown in the above statement provided me by the Treasury Department.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.



Mr. LUNDEEN. It would seem to me that Germany should be held responsible for the Czechoslovakian and Austrian debts.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am quite in accord with the Senator. In view of the fact that the Senator has suggested that Germany took over Czechoslovakian territory I am thoroughly of the opinion that Germany should be called upon to assume obligations that were made by Czechoslovakia, and I do not see how anyone could argue otherwise.

#### FINLAND—HONEST, INDUSTRIOUS, PROGRESSIVE

Mr. LUNDEEN. If I may make a brief statement here I should like to say that great credit is due to the Republic of Finland, which has scrupulously observed its obligations to this Government. It is true that of the original debt they are only paying on about one-half, but that is the amount fixed in the refunding agreement, and they are paying all that is required under that agreement, and they are the only nation that are so doing, and it is to the eternal credit and glory of that country and that people that they are doing so.

They have shown their sterling honesty to our country. I will certainly join with the Senator in his statement that we in America could use this money now for the benefit of our people.

I should also like to suggest that along our coast line here, circling the Panama Canal and the Nicaragua Canal region, making an impossible barrier where we cannot even get our ships through without permission from a foreign government in times of war, are islands which ought to be under the American flag. They ought to belong to Uncle Sam. They ought to be American territory. They are American islands, and these foreign governments should turn them over now to apply on the debts that they refuse to pay. The British Empire has nearly one-third of the world under its flag and boasts that it is the greatest empire of all time. This Empire has 600,000,000 people under its flag; this Empire has five times the gold production of the United States. Canada alone produces as much gold as the United States; South Africa four times as much as the United States. They come over here and try to dazzle us with their diamonds and their diadems; their crowns, and other royal jewelry. Their royal salary is \$5,000,000 a year, whereas our President is paid \$75,000 a year.

They paid the commander in chief of their Army, Marshal Haig, a bonus of \$500,000 after the war, which I take it was American money; and he never won a great battle in his life. He served under a French general. He did not have the capacity and ability to be commander in chief in the World War, but he absorbed \$500,000 of our money.

Mr. REYNOLDS. We paid his salary.

Mr. LUNDEEN. When the war was over we paid him a bonus of \$500,000; and he never won an important battle in his life. He served under a French general, Foch. The British paid—I presume with our money—\$500,000 to Admiral Beatty, who lost three men and three tons to the Germans' one in the Battle of Jutland, although it must be said to the credit of the British Fleet that they succeeded in isolating the German Fleet. However, the losses were 3 to 1. He received \$500,000, I take it, of American money that we loaned the British. No wonder they are paying these huge amounts and can be so liberal with our money.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And with other people's property. For example, Czechoslovakia is always appeasing at the expense of somebody else.

Mr. President, lest we forget, the figures referred to should be stamped on the memory of every man and every woman in each of our 48 States, thus making it conclusive that our great Uncle Sam will never again—I hope—act as Santa Claus to any ungrateful country or countries.

Think of what happens to one of us when we do not pay our bills. Think of what happens to me when I do not pay my bills. Our creditors are very polite at first. They send us a gentle reminder. Then if we do not pay they begin to get "tough." We receive a strong letter, their attorney telephones, and finally we hear a rap on the door, and there stands the man they sent to collect the debt. That is why, Mr. President, I have taken the floor today to urge upon the Senate that we appoint a collector to collect the money which various countries in Europe owe to 130,000,000 Americans. Why should we go on piling up national debts and carrying a terrific load of international debts? We should not. We should dun Europe until we collect the debts, Mr. President. Why should we not have a collector to rap on the doors of the exchequers of Europe? Why should not some of the cash which Europe is spending for armaments be spent to pay some of its billions upon billions of debt to the 130,000,000 people of the United States?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Gladly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wonder if the Senator means that we are not now trying to collect the money?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have not lately heard anybody ask them to pay us.

#### PERFUMED LETTERS AND SCENTED NOTES

Mr. LUNDEEN. Are we only sending over perfumed letters asking what they will do about it, and then receiving another scented note in reply? Or is there any Jacksonian red blood and backbone in the American Department of State? What has become of the Americanism we used to have in this country? Shall we stand idly by with 12,000,000 idle people starving to death in this country, and permit empires which are spending upward of \$10,000,000,000 in rearmament programs to continue to do so, sending out little perfumed notes and allowing them to come back with some little non-

essential statement, and then dropping the matter and saying nothing further about it? If that is Americanism, God save the word.

Mr. REYNOLDS. With 12,000,000 out of employment and \$13,000,000,000 due us when June 15 came, they did not even have the decency to write letters to the effect that they regretted that they could not liquidate any part of the principal or any portion of the interest.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I noted the same thing the Senator from North Carolina did on June 15 as to the failure of the nations which are in default to us even to acknowledge the fact that they owed us a debt. The thought occurred to me that if we could not get our money we might at least learn a lesson from our past experience. The thought occurred to me that it might be possible for the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution or a bill reciting the facts as to the debts owed us at the conclusion of the last war; as to the example of the United States in possibly the greatest exhibition of generosity which ever took place in international affairs in the history of the world, voluntarily scaling down all those debts to 60 percent; reciting the facts of default; and then setting aside June 15, the due date which has been so much ignored by foreign powers, as a national holiday, a day for meditation and prayer of the American people under the name of "keep-out-of-war day."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I shall be very happy indeed to support such a resolution.

Mr. President, on April 13 of this year I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12, which provides a practical and business-like way of collecting the debts. It calls for the employment of Mr. William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer, as a special envoy to the debtor nations for the purpose of assuring their fulfillment of their signed and sealed agreements with America to pay their debts in the manner specified in the agreements. There can be no question as to the qualifications of Mr. Griffin for this mission. His qualifications are set out in detail in my resolution.

Since the introduction of my resolution many distinguished Members of Congress have expressed, in interviews with the public press, their high opinion of Mr. Griffin's capabilities and enlightened patriotism and have warmly advocated his appointment as a special war-debt envoy. Statements regarding Mr. Griffin have been made by many. Among them are many of my colleagues in the Senate, including the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], and many Members of the House, including the Speaker thereof [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN]. To my mind the resolution calling for the designation of a special war-debt envoy is of such national importance that it should be acted upon at the earliest possible moment. I bespeak immediate consideration thereof, Mr. President.

Altogether, apart from the enormous sums involved, amounting to \$13,000,000,000, there is another vital matter at stake in the collection or noncollection of the debts. Mr. President, we hear much nowadays on both sides of the Atlantic concerning the sanctity of treaties and international good faith. It is the utter disregard for the sanctity of treaties and international good faith which animates so many of the Old World countries and which is at the bottom of the terrible ills from which the world today unquestionably is suffering. Our European war debtors, led by England and France, were the first in the post-war days to set an example of total disregard of the sanctity of treaties and international good faith when they decided to defraud Uncle Sam of the billions of dollars he loaned them when their backs were to the wall; and if we do not insist upon the payment of these debts we will place an unheard-of premium on international dishonesty.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

#### WAR DEBTS AND ESSENTIAL WAR MATERIALS

Mr. LUNDEEN. In that connection I should like to remind the Senator of the resolution introduced by the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which proposes to acquire essential war materials to apply on the payment of the debt.

Mr. REYNOLDS. By the way, if the Senator will pardon me for interrupting, I think the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] likewise introduced a resolution of that description several weeks ago. I see the Senator from Wisconsin in the Chamber. That is why I mention the matter at this particular time.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I thank the Senator. I was not aware of that fact. It is a very great credit to the able Senator from Wisconsin that he has introduced a resolution along that line.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In that connection I will say to the Senator that I have had in mind the introduction of a similar resolution.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I hope the distinguished and able Senator from North Carolina will do likewise, as he suggests.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am in thorough accord with that suggestion.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It seems to me there is one very logical, sensible method of obtaining at least a partial payment. I am now making a survey of certain islands on the west coast of the Panama Canal Zone, within a certain circumference which would be within striking distance of bombing planes. I have some information from the War Department in that connection. I find that the

French have an island in that vicinity which we could well use; and certain other islands can be acquired by negotiation and purchase. It seems to me that the resolutions which have been introduced looking to the acquirement of essential war materials in payment of the debts are really in the nature of defense measures.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Such measures would serve the Treasury of the United States and save the taxpayers' money. Why not think of American taxpayers once in a while instead of always weeping on the shoulders of Great Britain and France? Other and debtor nations have great quantities of copper, of bauxite, which are used in the manufacture of aluminum, and of other essential materials that we should have. Let them turn such materials over to our country, and we will give them credit on the debts.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator is quite correct. In that connection I remind the Senator at this time that not so long ago this body passed a bill pertaining to essential war materials which we do not have in this country, to the extent of requiring an appropriation of \$100,000,000.

I have suggested, and later in my argument here today shall again suggest, that the debtor countries be provided the opportunity of liquidating, at least in part, their obligation to us in tin and in rubber and in nickel, materials of which we are not possessed in this country; and if they would do that, it would not affect the production or sale of anything of that sort that we have here in the United States.

Mr. President, it is imperative to compel the payment of these defaulted billions. The time has arrived when we must demand payment. The matter now has reached such a stage that it is absolutely necessary for us to send a special envoy to Europe to set the collection wheels turning and assure that they will keep turning until they have ground out the very last cent due the taxpayers of your State of Oklahoma and the taxpayers of all the other States of the Union.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am in full sympathy with what the Senator wants to do so far as the debts are concerned. The Senator says the time has come when we should demand payment of the debts. After we make the demand, however, if nothing is done, what are we going to do?

Mr. REYNOLDS. There are many things we could do. As a matter of fact, if Great Britain refused to pay her war debts, in my humble opinion we could seize properties in the United States today belonging to Great Britain or belonging to any of the British people. In addition to that, the British are possessed of considerable wealth in the neighborhood of the United States, and we could bring about considerable embarrassment in that connection. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that if we should demand payment of the moneys which the British Government owes the taxpayers of the United States and should let the British governmental representatives know that we meant business, in the fix that they are now in they would not dare deny payment.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand the Senator now to advocate the seizure of certain properties nearby which belong to England in the event they should refuse to pay their debt?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all; I do not advocate that.

Mr. LUCAS. But I understood the Senator, in his previous remarks to me, to say that that could be done when I asked him, after a demand was made, if there should be a refusal to pay or no evidence of any bona fide intention to pay, what this country would do toward the collection of the debt.

I want to collect the debt just as badly as does the Senator from North Carolina; but I am wondering what vehicle the Senator from North Carolina is going to use in case the demands are refused.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator that we shall never reach that stage. As I said a moment ago, if we let Great Britain know that we mean business, and that we in this country need the \$13,000,000,000 that is due us to take care of our millions of unfortunate people who are out of employment and who are dependent upon the Government of the United States to care for them, Great Britain will liquidate that obligation. We know that Great Britain has the money with which to pay us. We know that she is possessed of the gold with which to pay us, because Great Britain is constantly making loans to various other countries of the world, and spending billions upon billions for armaments in preparing for another war to preserve her empire; but, unfortunately, she is not sufficiently grateful to pay the American people the amounts that she borrowed and that we loaned to her during the trying days of the World War, from 1914 to 1918, when she was participating in that conflict.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me the last time Great Britain made any payment on this obligation?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It has been many years. I do not exactly recall.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that we can judge the future only by the past, and that if the British have not paid any of this indebtedness in the past, and they have all of this property with which to pay, a mere demand by this country is not going to cause them to pay?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe England has any intention of paying her war debt. Some of the men highest in authority in Great Britain have said that they do not owe us anything; that as a matter of fact we did not do them any good. They have said that if we had not sent our forces over there, they would have settled the war in 1917. Some men high in authority in Great Britain have said that we really were injurious

to them, and that if we had not gotten into the war millions of lives would have been saved.

I am very happy the Senator mentioned that matter, because I am going to bring to the attention of the Members of this body a conversation which took place between an American citizen and some of those in authority in Great Britain. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe the British have the slightest intention upon earth of paying us. I say that, first, as a result of the fact that I have been advised of conversations that took place between an American citizen and those in high authority in Great Britain; and, in the second place, because the British are possessed of more wealth than perhaps any other nation upon the face of the earth outside of our own United States, and yet they have never evidenced the slightest desire or inclination to make payment of this obligation, which the Senator from Illinois most certainly agrees with me is due.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will further yield, in view of his last statement, that he believes England never intended to pay the debt, what good can be accomplished by sending to England this ambassador of good will, so to speak, for the purpose of trying to collect it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. There are many times when one who is indebted to another does not pay, and does not really interest himself in making an endeavor to liquidate an obligation, so long as he receives perfumed notes such as were mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], but when the creditor's lawyer gets after him, and then when finally the sheriff knocks on the door, and the debtor knows that the creditor means business, the debtor wakes up and makes an earnest effort to liquidate at least a portion of the obligation.

Mr. LUCAS. I can appreciate the sheriff knocking on the door in the case of a private obligation between two citizens of this country; but the point I am trying to ascertain from the distinguished and able Senator from North Carolina, who is constantly talking upon this question—and I think it is a very good thing for the country—is what the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Minnesota are going to do about this matter in the final analysis if England and the other defaulting nations continue to refuse to pay their obligations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Before we ascertain what procedure we shall take, I think first we should let those in high authority in the debtor nations at least know that we mean business. As a matter of fact, according to my recollection, we have never proposed to them that they deliver or arrange to deliver to us any part or portion of any lands they have in the Western Hemisphere in part payment of their indebtedness.

Mr. LUCAS. It would be fine if they would do that. We could use these islands, of course, or any of the lands that belong to England, as part payment, perhaps; but suppose they say, "No; we are not going to do it"?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let us not make that supposition until after we have made the request. Let us first ascertain whether or not the debtor nations are really desirous of evidencing their appreciation and demonstrating their honesty by complying with the request. In that connection, I desire to make particular mention of another matter at this time, in view of the fact that the subject was broached a moment ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN]. He mentioned the fact that Great Britain is the possessor of some islands just beyond gun range of the Panama Canal. In addition to that, as the Senator knows, she owns British Honduras. In addition to that she has a number of islands strung through the West Indies, beginning at Port of Spain, the capital of Trinidad, and reaching around the arc of the West Indies by way of Martinique and the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Haiti, and over to Cuba. She has land there that we want. We have had some discussion upon the floor of the Senate, we have seen much in the columns of the press almost daily, in reference to our national-defense program, in reference to the suggestion that we fortify the circle in order that we may well assure the safety of the entrance to and the locks of the Panama Canal from the Atlantic.

By the way, I might mention something which to my mind is just as important as that. Great Britain owns, within an hour's travel by airplane from Miami, Fla., the islands of Bimini and Nassau; and from there it is only an hour and a half more by plane until we reach the island of Bermuda, the capital of which is Hamilton. Hamilton is a distance of only 500 miles directly east of the coast of North Carolina. I have heretofore suggested that England might be prevailed upon to bring about the transfer of that piece of property to us; and we would be particularly interested in that, for the reason that 95 percent of all the revenue derived by the Government of Great Britain through its capital and seaport of Hamilton comes out of the port of the city of New York; whereas, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON], who is present this afternoon, knows, Bimini and Nassau are only a few miles off the coast of Florida.

We do not want to be rude about the matter; we want to be as gracious as we possibly can be; we do not desire to incur any ill feeling if it can be avoided; but let us seriously ask if they would be willing to make transfer of some of this property in the Western Hemisphere which we really need.

In addition to that, of course, they might be able to make some arrangement about Newfoundland. There are a couple of islands just north of Newfoundland, and the French also have possessions in the Western Hemisphere.

I shall in a moment bring to the attention of this body some very interesting conversations which took place between an American citizen and officials high in authority in England.



Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I wish to call attention to the fact that the British did pay something up until about 1931.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not remember the date of the last payment.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The records of the Debt Commission will show. What we ask them to do now is to resume payments. They did pay some. Let them resume; or have they been told they do not need to pay any more? If so, who told them that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The data I have do not cover the last interest payment.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Why did they stop? Did some one say, "It is all right; it can ride along for awhile, and we will not ask you for it"? Is that what happened? Why did we suddenly become so mellow and so kindly and so gentle with this great, huge, warlike empire, upon which the sun never sets, but which has not paid its debts in recent years?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Is there any reason why we should not ask them to pay? Is there any reason why we should not knock at their door every day and request payment?

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. As I have understood the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Minnesota, they are advocating taking over the islands they have mentioned. Has it not been our experience that the islands we now have are a liability instead of an asset?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I quite agree.

Mr. MINTON. Then why does the Senator want to have us take on some more?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Our naval authorities and others interested in national defense have suggested that we should erect fortifications, particularly in that area of the Atlantic, which would provide greater and better protection for the eastern entrance to the Panama Canal.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the able Senator kindly yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

#### THE RICHES OF THE WEST INDIES

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have frequently been met with this statement, "What do you want with those sand bars out there in the West Indies?" Now, I am making an exhaustive research into the resources of these islands of the West Indies, and, with the permission of the Senate, I shall at a later date be glad to present the record of the untold resources of these islands. I cannot hope to give a complete picture of their resources, but at least in part I hope to do so. For instance, in Trinidad there is an inexhaustible asphalt mine. We have recently heard about that in connection with paving matters here in Washington. For a hundred years those operating that mine have taken that substance out of the earth, and it just wells right up to the same level, and, so far as anyone knows, this material, no matter how much is taken out for a thousand years to come, will remain at the same level.

Just today I cut an article out of a paper in which it is stated that the island of Saba, a small island in the West Indies, contains the only pure sulfur mine in the world.

"The only pure sulfur mine in the world is on the strange island of Saba, lying south of the Virgin Islands. Saba is a volcanic cone rising from the sea. Eight hundred steps lead up from the beach to the town, curiously called the Bottom, and peopled by an isolated community of thrifty Dutch, who construct seaworthy sloops inside the crater and lower them over the rocks to the sea.—Carl Kulberg."

Consider Bermuda, for instance. Is there any greater tourist point in the Western Hemisphere than Bermuda? Is that not a gold mine in itself? And it is American money that pours in there in an ever-increasing tide.

The fishing grounds of the West Indies are world famous and may well prove to be inexhaustible—from the same source I include the following clipping—

"The Atlantic Ocean off the Bahama Banks is often less than 30 feet deep, and the unusual transparency of the water reveals many sea denizens. About 100 miles north of Puerto Rico is Nares Deep, the deepest known spot—27,972 feet."

Mr. REYNOLDS. What about Jamaica?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Of course. The distinguished Senator is more traveled than I and is more familiar with these things, but I am somewhat familiar with them. Would anyone think of turning back Puerto Rico? We recently appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for the fortification of Puerto Rico. Would anyone think of turning back the strategic Virgin Islands, 100 miles farther east than Puerto Rico? Would anyone want to relinquish the protectorate which we have over Cuba? Though that is a free country, yet there is an American protectorate over it, and we would not permit any foreign foe to come there, or any European flag to fly over that great island.

#### WEST INDIES VITAL TO AMERICAN DEFENSE

These islands are possessed of great resources, and it is about time that the American people got the information that here are great resources right at our front doorstep, and here we have the finest and best air bases. From Bermuda an enemy nation can strike Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia, or any of the east-coast cities within 2 or 3 hours with their bombers. We should have Bermuda as our base. It should be American. It should not be under a foreign flag. It is an American island, and it is and of right ought to be American.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me say to the Senator, in reference to the value of these islands, that, according to my recollection, during the course of the World War the United States paid \$25,000,000 for the Virgin Islands, and we would not sell them at any price now, because we desire to fortify them. I thank Senators for their kind inquiries and contributions. If we do not insist upon payment of these debts, we will place an unheard-of premium on international dishonesty.

It is imperative to compel the payment of these defaulted billions of dollars. The matter has now reached a stage where it is absolutely necessary to send a special envoy to Europe to collect the debts.

I wish to call particular attention to a statement by the President of the United States himself. Five years ago the President said concerning the war debts:

"These obligations furnished vital means for the successful conclusion of a war which involved the national existence of the borrowers, and later for a quicker restoration of their normal life after the war ended."

"The money loaned by the United States Government was in turn borrowed by the United States Government from the people of the United States; and our Government, in the absence of payment from foreign governments, is compelled to raise the shortage by general taxation of its own people in order to pay off the original Liberty bonds and the later refunding bonds."

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

#### TAXING AMERICANS TO HELP THE BRITISH

Mr. LUNDEEN. Then I understand that we are raising money by taxation of our American people to support the British Empire right now?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. LUNDEEN. According to the President's own statement.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not only that; but they are asking that we take all the refugees from all the earth, all those they do not want in their own countries, and feed them, when there are millions here who are hungry. The President of the United States stated that one-third of our people are undernourished, ill-housed, and improperly clothed. The President continued:

"It is for these reasons that the American people have felt that their debtors were called upon to make a determined effort to discharge these obligations. The American people would not be disposed to place an impossible burden upon their debtors"—

And we would not—

"but are nevertheless in a just position to ask that substantial sacrifices be made to meet these debts."

That is what the President of the United States said in particular reference to the subject I have under discussion at this time. The President continued—and this was 5 years ago:

"We shall continue to expect the debtors on their part to show full understanding of the American attitude on this debt question. The people of the debtor nations will also bear in mind the fact that the American people are certain to be swayed by the use which debtor countries make of their available resources—whether such resources would be applied for the purposes of recovery as well as for reasonable payment on the debt owed to the citizens of the United States, for the purposes of unproductive nationalistic expenditure, or like purposes."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The mere fact that the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, made certain statements 5 years ago would not be any indication that he believes those statements or would stand by them today, would it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I beg the Senator's pardon?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator was referring to some statements made by the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt. My question was, judging from our experience, is it the opinion of the Senator, simply because Mr. Roosevelt, President of the United States, made those statements 5 years ago, that would be an indication that he believed them or would stand by them today?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the President of the United States made those statements then, and I am sure that the President of the United States would today stand by the same statements he then made. But that would be no indication of the fact that the President of the United States is not desirous that Great Britain should pay her war debts. As a matter of fact, I am thoroughly and firmly of the opinion that the President of the United States is just as desirous of collecting the honest debts that are due to the taxpayers of America as is the Senator from New Hampshire or as I am, if I may say so.

Mr. BRIDGES. My answer to the Senator is that from my personal observation of the President of the United States and his very shifting positions, I would not be at all sure that the fact that he said something 5 years ago would be any indication that he believed the same way today. I should think that he might have changed several times in the meantime, and perhaps may have a wholly different view today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States is but human, like the Senator and myself, and conditions change. Many times have I changed my position, and I am convinced that the Senator will agree with me that many times he has changed his position. The position depends entirely upon the shifting of sands, and time has a great deal to do with the shifting of sands.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe a person should change to meet conditions, but the President for one seems to me personally to be able to shift even faster than conditions shift.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In what particular respect does the Senator mean?

Mr. BRIDGES. In about every respect that I have observed. For instance, on fiscal policies.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I cannot recall at this time any instance in which the President of the United States has shifted without due cause, or for perfect reason, I may say.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not want to embarrass the Senator in that respect, but I should recall that the President was elected on a platform of economy, and that he took the position that there should be a 25-percent reduction in expenditures, and so on, and it seems to me that he has shifted greatly from that position.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I may say to the Senator that when the President of the United States took office in March 1933 conditions thereafter immediately changed. We had been going from bad to worse, and when the present President of the United States took office he found millions upon millions of unfortunate men and women who were undernourished and improperly clothed, and he found suffering and misery on every hand. Being the great humanitarian that we have found him to be, he endeavored as best he could, as all Americans have endeavored as best they could, to find jobs for those unfortunate people who were not able to find jobs. Industry had not been able to provide them with employment. We had been in a depression, as the Senator recalls, many years before the President took office, a depression which began in October 1929, and I will say to the Senator that the President's position has never shifted from the time he took office in March 1933 up to the present time insofar as being interested in the unfortunate men and women of this country.

Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will go along with me and vote money out of the Treasury of the United States so long as there are empty stomachs to be filled, and so long as there are poor men and women to be cared for.

Mr. BRIDGES. The President probably has not shifted in his feeling toward the unfortunates, but his approach to dealing with those unfortunates has shifted many, many times.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the time for leniency toward our war-debt defaulters has passed. No one can justly say that we have acted like a Shylock. The debtor nations have accused us of being a Shylock. The heart of the whole trouble lies in the fact that our war debtors simply do not wish to pay. And as I stated a moment ago they do not intend to pay. Had they the will to make good they could have made good long ago, and their making good would have been as beneficial to them as it would have been to us. The other day, the outstanding economist, M. S. Rukeyser, whose articles are closely studied daily from coast to coast, hit the nail on the head when he affirmed—I quote from the New York Journal-American:

"The pivotal excuse for the default has been the difficulty of international transfer of large sums, especially in times of depressed trade. However, the argument that payment can only be made in goods and services, or in gold does not reveal the whole truth. Individuals and financial institutions in Great Britain and France own substantial holdings of American securities, tangible property, and bank balances. If the will to liquidate the war debt existed, this could be accomplished by mobilizing these foreign holdings of American assets and turning them over to the American Treasury, thus obviating the awkward necessity for transfer of colossal sums through the foreign exchange market. The British and French Governments could then reimburse their own nationals in their own currency or internal bonds."

That was the answer I gave a moment ago to the senior Senator from the State of Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] when he made inquiry as to how we could bring about the collection of the debt or any portion thereof.

France, England, and Italy, the leaders in the war-debt defaulters' united front, while brazenly asserting that they have not the wherewithal to meet their indebtedness to us, are making loans wholesale to European countries for political and commercial advantage, as was stated a moment ago by the able Senator from Minnesota, who has just risen, and to whom I gladly yield now.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, briefly, I wish to say that I wonder if the great Empires of Britain and France are not setting a rather bad example to the little nations or smaller nations who owe us money. There are a score of nations who owe us money, and I imagine in their chancelleries they will say, "Well, Britain and France are not paying. Why should we?" And so the whole debt structure collapses right there.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly they are setting a very bad precedent, because we know by experience that unless the larger nations pay, the smaller nations are not going to make the slightest gesture toward paying.

Mr. President, on June 6, less than 2 weeks ago, the United Press transmitted a news dispatch from London to the United States which stated:

"Great Britain has extended substantial new credits to Turkey, it was understood today, since Turkey joined the Anglo-French security front. The sum of \$46,862,500 was mentioned. It was recalled that Britain lent Turkey \$74,980,000 in April 1938."

The temerity of England in carrying out a transaction of this kind less than 2 weeks before the semiannual payment on her war debt to Uncle Sam fell due is beyond the bounds of adequate condemnation.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Would it be just to say that, so far as the British Empire is concerned, they have said, in effect, millions for the Turks, but not a dollar for America?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Right!

Mr. President, if it were true that our war debtors were unable to liquidate their indebtedness to us in cash, that would not in the least absolve them from the solemn duty of paying us every cent they owe us. England controls the rubber—referring to the subject mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN]—the tin, and the nickel supply of the world. The United States is the largest market for these three products. Had Great Britain the will to pay, she could readily make use of these products in the liquidation of her indebtedness to us, as suggested by innumerable resolutions introduced in Congress. The plain truth of the whole situation is that not one of our war debtors is actuated by good faith, and each is determined to defraud Uncle Sam of his war-debt account if Uncle Sam will only permit it.

We are all Americans, whether we are Democrats or Republicans. There is no such thing as Republican Americanism. There is no such thing as Democratic Americanism. It is just plain Americanism. We all love America, and each of us is at all times eager to serve her to the best of his ability. None of us would knowingly wrong his country.

One of the gravest misfortunes which can befall any nation is that of being contemptible in the eyes of the world. Whether or not we realize it, the United States of America is regarded with supreme contempt throughout the globe as a gullible nation. In order to show the attitude of our war debtors toward us I wish to give the Senate some information which has been given to me by Mr. William Griffin, the editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer. This information startled me, Mr. President. As a matter of fact, I heard about it only about 3 or 4 months ago, when I was talking with him. I am confident that it will startle the Senate.

During a recent trip to Europe, Mr. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty in the British Cabinet during the World War, invited Mr. Griffin to call on him at his home in London. During the course of a long visit Mr. Churchill asked what were some of the questions uppermost in the minds of the American people regarding Anglo-American relations. The questions were asked by Winston Churchill of Mr. William Griffin, his American guest. Mr. Griffin told Mr. Churchill that the outstanding issue in the United States that was disturbing Anglo-American relations was England's failure to pay her war debt.

Mr. Churchill then said to Mr. Griffin:

"I think that England should pay every single dollar she has borrowed from your country. But before paying in full she should be allowed to deduct half the cost of all the shot and shell she fired at the Germans from the time America declared war until she put soldiers in the front-line trenches over a year later."

Asked if we allowed England to make the deduction in question, how much would it amount to, Mr. Churchill answered:

"I was in a position to know just how much it cost England to carry on the war, and, according to my figures, England should be allowed to deduct \$4,900,000,000 from the debt America claims England owes her before a final settlement is made. When you declared war you became partners in war, and therefore your country should be willing to bear its just cost of carrying on the war."

Mr. Griffin then told Mr. Churchill that it was our opinion that America had saved the British Empire from destruction and from overwhelming defeat. Mr. Churchill disagreed with him regarding America's contribution toward winning the war, and stated unequivocally that although he was enthusiastic over our declaration of war, he could now see that it was all a horrible mistake, and that we should have stayed at home and attended to our own business.

Mr. Churchill said England would not have lost the war, because, said he:

"We would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917, and by so doing would have saved over a million British and French lives."

As I mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Churchill continued—think of the audacity of this—

"America's entrance into the war was disastrous not only for your country but for the Allies as well, because had you stayed at home and minded your own business we would have made peace with the Central Powers in the spring of 1917, and then there would have been no collapse in Russia, followed by communism; no breakdown in Italy, followed by fascism; and Nazi-ism would not at present be enthroned in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war and minded her own business, none of these 'isms' would today be sweeping the Continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government."

Now, Mr. President, let us turn to Mr. Lloyd George, wartime Prime Minister of England.

The former British Prime Minister explained to Mr. Griffin, while Mr. Griffin was his guest, that the United States could have brought an end to the World War without sending a single soldier to France, a single ship to the North Sea, or a single airplane to the western front, or, for that matter, spending a single dollar in Europe for war purposes. Said Mr. Lloyd George:

"When the World War broke out in 1914 Theodore Roosevelt advocated that the United States raise and equip a standing Army of 1,000,000 soldiers and build the largest and most powerful Navy in the world, and constitute an air force to back up your Army and Navy. If you had adopted that program and had your Army, Navy, and air force ready for war in the summer of 1915 or 1916, and then you had called on the warring nations of Europe to sit



down around the council table and talk peace, we would have acceded, because we would not have known which side you might plunge in on, and all the nations in Europe at war would have feared the armed might of America."

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the President of the United States and the administration for insisting upon an adequate force of armed men and sufficient supplies of every nature in this country because, in my humble opinion, with strength we shall not experience any difficulty with anybody.

Lloyd George continued:

"You went to war with us in 1812 over the freedom of the seas, but I think we offended you just as much by our activities on the high seas during the World War as we did in 1812. On the other hand, the Germans also offended you by their submarine warfare, which resulted in the sinking of a number of American-flag ships."

President Albert Lebrun, of France, received Mr. Griffin in the Elysee Palace in Paris and told him that he was always glad to welcome an American to his country because Americans seemed to realize the vast debt that their country owed the great Republic of France. He was sure, he added, that France was the best liked of all the European countries in America, and that it would be impossible for anyone to travel from one end of America to the other and find a person who had any reason to be critical of his country, France.

Lebrun was told America felt that France should pay its war debt to the United States. Lebrun, who had been seated at his desk, bounded out of his chair and declared that France's war debt to America would never be paid, and said that the fact that France was not paying her war debt was all the fault of former President Hoover. He pounded the desk and stated that in 1931 Mr. Hoover, in order to prevent a collapse in Germany—and that was the last year, according to my recollection, in which England made any payment upon the debt—had asked the Allies to grant Germany a moratorium for 1 year on reparations payments, and had agreed that if they would do so the United States would grant them a moratorium on their war-debt payments. President Lebrun declared:

"Surely, the United States wouldn't expect us to continue payments on our war debt if we in turn couldn't collect from Germany."

Mr. President, as you know and as we all know, there is a vast difference and distinction between debts of that sort from Germany and the war debts which the Allies contracted with the United States. One is liquidation of damages. The war debts due to the United States represent cash actually loaned by the taxpayers of the United States of America, who are bearing the burden of the payments which are now due.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to have the Record show at that point the position of Andrew Jackson in regard to the collection of the French war debt of 1800, resulting from an undeclared war which we fought with France at that time. I had the privilege of addressing the Senate two or three times on that subject. That is one of the greatest state papers ever written in the messages and papers of American Presidents.

#### FORGET THE BANQUETS AND FOLLOW JACKSON

Instead of holding so many banquets in honor of Andrew Jackson and then failing to follow his doctrines and policies, I wish that at these banquets some of his state papers would be read, and that after the banquet was over we would see the administration follow the policies that Andrew Jackson laid down.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In reference to the paper which has just been mentioned by the Senator, I should be very grateful to the Senator if he would be good enough to bring about the insertion in the Record of that particular document, in order that the American people may know the action which Andrew Jackson threatened to take at the time France would not pay.

Mr. LUNDEEN. With the Senator's permission and the Senate's permission, I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"[From the Congressional Record of June 9, 1933, p. 5511]

"ANDREW JACKSON, AMERICAN, AND THE FRENCH DEBT—FAILURE OF FRANCE TO PAY AMERICA INSTALLMENTS DUE ON WORLD WAR AND POST WORLD WAR DEBTS RECALLS STERN, SUCCESSFUL MEASURES TAKEN BY 'HICKORY'

"Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

"The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

"There was no objection.

"Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about how to handle our foreign debts—the French debts and other debts. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to show the wonderful statesmanlike manner in which Andrew Jackson, a real fighting American and a great Democrat, handled a similar situation in his time. [Applause.]

"The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"There was no objection.

"Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, before the years 1800–1817 a series of unprovoked aggressions upon our commerce was authorized and

sanctioned by the Government of France, most of which occurred during the time that Napoleon was conducting his many wars, and particularly his wars against England. There is a striking parallel between the aggressions on our commerce at that time and the aggressions committed on our commerce by the contending parties in 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, during the World War; the only difference being a matter of degree, and the fact that lives were lost by reason of the aggressions during this last war.

"Our Government during this terrific struggle between the Government of France, headed by Napoleon, and the other European countries, took the attitude that any damage to our commerce or injury that we received by reason of said war could be adjusted after the war was over. As a result, at the conclusion of these wars our Government insisted that the French Government pay for these wrongs perpetrated upon our commerce; and after considerable negotiations a treaty between our Government and the French Government was concluded and signed, on the 4th day of July 1831, by which it was stipulated and set forth as stated in President Jackson's message to Congress December 1, 1834, that—

"The French Government, in order to liberate itself from all reclamations preferred against it by citizens of the United States for unlawful seizures, captures, sequestrations, confiscations, or destruction of their vessels, cargoes, or other property, engages to pay a sum of 25,000,000 francs to the United States, who shall distribute it among those entitled, in the manner and according to the rules it shall determine."

"According to this treaty, the French Government was to pay this 25,000,000 francs in six annual installments of 4,166,666 francs and 66 centimes each—

"The first installment to be paid at the expiration of 1 year next following the exchange of the ratification of this convention, and the others at successive intervals of a year, one after another, till the whole shall be paid. To the amount of each of the said installments shall be added interest at 4 percent thereupon \* \* \*

"This treaty was duly ratified by both parties, and the ratification was exchanged at the city of Washington on February 2, 1832.

"Jackson, in his message, goes on to say:

"No legislative provision has been made by France for the execution of this treaty, either as it respects the indemnity to be paid or the commercial benefits to be secured to the United States. \* \* \*

"Advice of the exchange of ratifications reached Paris prior to April 8, 1832. The French Chambers were then sitting, and continued in session until the 21st of that month, and although one installment of the indemnity was payable on February 2, 1833, 1 year after the exchange of ratifications, no application was made to the Chambers for the required appropriation; and in consequence of no appropriation having then been made, the draft of the United States Government for that installment was dishonored by the Minister of France, and the United States thereby involved in much controversy.

"The next session of the Chambers commenced on November 19, 1832, and continued until April 25, 1833. Notwithstanding the omission to pay the first installment had been the subject of earnest remonstrance on our part, the treaty with the United States and a bill making the necessary appropriations to execute it were not laid before the Chamber of Deputies until April 6, nearly 5 months after its meeting, and only 19 days before the close of the session. The bill was read and referred to a committee, but there was no further action upon it.

"The next session of the Chambers commenced on April 26, 1833, and continued until June 26 following. A new bill was introduced on June 11, but nothing important was done in relation to it during the session.

"In the month of April 1834, nearly 3 years after the signature of the treaty, the final action of the French Chambers upon the bill to carry the treaty into effect was obtained, and resulted in a refusal of the necessary appropriations. \* \* \*

"The refusal to vote the appropriation, the news of which was received from our Minister in Paris about the 15th day of May last (1834), might have been considered the final determination of the French Government not to execute the stipulations of the treaty, and would have justified an immediate communication of the facts to Congress, with a recommendation of such ultimate measures as the interest and honor of the United States might seem to require. But with the news of the refusal of the Chambers to make the appropriation were conveyed the regrets of the King and a declaration that a national vessel should be forthwith sent out with instructions to the French Minister to give the most ample explanations of the past and the strongest assurances for the future. After a long passage the promised dispatch vessel arrived. The pledges given by the French Minister upon receipt of his instructions were that as soon after the election of the new members as the charter would permit the legislative chambers of France should be called together and the proposition for an appropriation laid before them; that all the constitutional powers of the King and his cabinet should be exerted to accomplish the object; and that the result should be made known early enough to be communicated to Congress at the commencement of the present session."

"The French Government of 1834 had the decency to apologize for its failure to pay an obligation.

"Andrew Jackson, relying upon these pledges, did not communicate the above facts to Congress, relying, as he did, upon the assurances of the French Government. In this message of December 1, 1834, Andrew Jackson goes on to say:

"I regret to say that the pledges made through the Minister of France have not been redeemed. The new Chambers met on July

81 last, and although the subject of fulfilling treaties was alluded to in the speech from the throne, no attempt was made by the King or his cabinet to procure an appropriation to carry it into execution.'

"Andrew Jackson then makes this emphatic assertion:

"The idea of acquiescing to the refusal to execute the treaty will not, I am confident, be for a moment entertained by any branch of this Government, and further negotiation upon the subject is equally out of question."

"And then Andrew Jackson goes on to say:

"Our institutions are essentially pacific. Peace and friendly intercourse with all nations are as much the desire of our Government as they are the interest of our people. But these objects are not to be permanently secured by surrendering the rights of our citizens or permitting solemn treaties for their indemnity, in cases of flagrant wrong, to be abrogated or set aside."

"Andrew Jackson was not a man who indulged in fine speech, but when he was through speaking no one could doubt the meaning of his words. For example, he goes on to say:

"There is but one point in the controversy, and upon that the whole civilized world must pronounce France to be in the wrong. We insist that she shall pay us a sum of money which she has acknowledged to be due, and of the justice of this demand there can be but one opinion among mankind."

"And a few sentences later in his message he said:

"It is my conviction that the United States ought to insist on a prompt execution of the treaty, and in case it be refused or longer delayed, take redress into their own hands. After the delay on the part of France of a quarter of a century in acknowledging these claims by treaty, it is not to be tolerated that another quarter of a century is to be wasted in negotiating about the payment. The laws of nations provide a remedy for such occasions. It is a well-settled principle of the International Code that where one nation owes another a liquidated debt which it refuses or neglects to pay the aggrieved party may seize on the property belonging to the other, its citizens, or subjects sufficient to pay the debt without giving just cause of war. This remedy has been repeatedly resorted to and recently by France herself toward Portugal, under circumstances less unquestionable."

"And, then, listen to the American attitude of a real American when he says:

"Since France, in violation of the pledges given through her Minister here, has delayed her final action so long that her decision will not, probably, be known in time to be communicated to this Congress, I recommend that a law be passed authorizing reprisals upon French property in case provision shall not be made for the payment of the debt at the approaching session of the French Chambers. Such a measure ought not to be considered by France as a menace. Her pride and power are too well known to expect anything from her fears and preclude the necessity of a declaration that nothing partaking of the character of intimidation is intended by us. She ought to look upon it as the evidence only of an inflexible determination on the part of the United States to insist on their rights. That Government by doing only what it has itself acknowledged to be just will be able to spare the United States the necessity of taking redress into their own hands and save the property of French citizens from that seizure and sequestration which American citizens so long endured without retaliation or redress. If she should continue to refuse that act of acknowledged justice and, in violation of the law of nations, make reprisals on our part the occasion of hostilities against the United States, she would but add violence to injustice, and could not fail to expose herself to the just censure of civilized nations and to the retributive judgments of Heaven."

"Collision with France is the more to be regretted on account of the position she occupies in Europe in relation to liberal institutions, but in maintaining our national rights and honor all governments are alike to us."

"The result of this message to Congress was the cause of great excitement in France, and the French Government, instead of acknowledging that they were in the wrong and offering to make amends to pay the debt which they had solemnly declared to be due under the treaty, dispatched war fleets to the coasts of the country, and bills were introduced in the French Chambers for increased military activity, looking to war with the United States. In other words, France was on the point of going to war with the United States over 25,000,000 francs rather than pay her honest and acknowledged obligation. However, we had in the White House a man who not only was a real American but one who could not be frightened even in the early days of this Republic by the power and majesty of the French Government."

"Without going into further details of this controversy, the firm American attitude of Andrew Jackson resulted in the full payment by the French Government of this obligation within a very short time, and without any war, and the net result was a greater respect for the American Republic on the part of the French Government than they had ever entertained before. It might also be added that during the Jackson administration the American Government had money coming from Denmark, from Spain, from the two Sicilies, and that Jackson in each and every case insisted on the prompt payment of these obligations; and when he left the Presidency, every foreign debt due the United States had been paid in full with the exception of Portugal's, which was paid in 1851."

"It might also be added that during the Revolutionary War France loaned the United States \$8,000,000, and when the treaty of peace was signed in Paris, September 3, 1783, the French de-

mand for a payment of this debt reached the United States before news of the signing of the treaty of peace reached our Government. Our American forefathers did not in reply plead poverty, did not shout to high heaven that they had just emerged from a 7-year war in defense of human liberty, and ask for "funding" of the debt on ability to pay. They paid in full and with interest."

"France must be taught the lesson in 1933 that a debtor who refuses to pay should be treated accordingly; that we Americans refuse to assume any more of her financial obligations to enable her to strut before the world the most militaristic nation on earth, spending over \$500,000,000 a year on armaments, while she has the second largest gold reserve in the world. She must be taught that breaking treaties and solemn obligations is just as dishonorable when perpetrated by France as when indulged in by any other nation; that dishonor is dishonor; that repudiation is repudiation. She must be taught that we have too high a regard for France herself to permit her in such a high-handed manner to flaunt the solemn obligation of her Government; and, lastly, she must be taught that we still believe what Jackson so forcibly said, that 'in maintaining our national rights and honor all governments are alike to us.' [Applause.]

"Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, let me quote again from Jackson's fourth annual message. Speaking of keeping out of the quarrels of Europe, he said:

"Nor have we less reason to felicitate ourselves on the position of our political than of our commercial concerns. They remain in the state in which they were when I last addressed you—a state of prosperity and peace, the effect of a wise attention to the parting advice of the revered Father of his Country on this subject, condensed into a maxim for the use of posterity by one of his most distinguished successors—to cultivate free commerce and honest friendship with all nations, but to make entangling alliances with none. A strict adherence to this policy has kept us aloof from the perplexing questions that now agitate the European world and have more than once deluged those countries with blood. Should those scenes unfortunately recur, the parties to the contest may count on a faithful performance of the duties incumbent on us as a neutral nation, and our own citizens may equally rely on the firm assertion of their neutral rights."

"Andrew Jackson's two terms as President of the United States covered the period from March 4, 1829, to March 4, 1837, and Europe, always on the brink of war, was in a dangerous frame of mind then, as now."

"Having followed in the footsteps of the Washington-Jefferson policy, Andrew Jackson was able to say in his fifth annual message, December 3, 1833:

"A large balance will remain in the Treasury after satisfying all the appropriations chargeable on the revenue for the present year."

"Jackson, in his sixth annual message, declared the country 'free from public debt, at peace with the world.'"

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, France will not pay us, she says, until she collects from Germany; but France has loaned billions of francs to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Greece, Yugoslavia, Russia, and many other European countries. The truth about the matter is, I think, that France has loaned to Poland more money than has been loaned to Poland by any other country in the world; and France has loaned great sums to Yugoslavia, because the French were expecting to experience the present difficulty with Germany; and France loaned these countries money for fortifications and for arms. If this money had been applied on the American war debt, it would have made a fine impression in the United States, as I related in the outset was stated to me by a taxi driver a few days ago when I was motoring up to the Capitol."

Mr. Griffin told me that as he was leaving President Lebrun remarked: "Of course, we are doing a great deal for Americans, and I know from their expressions of appreciation that they feel indebted to us for the way we honor them."

Lord Robert Cecil, president of the League of Nations Union and Minister of Blockade in the British Cabinet during the World War, told Mr. Griffin during a long talk he had with him in Paris that he felt absolutely certain of American cooperation with England in the next European war. When the war debts were brought up, Lord Cecil said that in his opinion they would never be paid. Said he:

"Your Government has the legal right to demand payment of the war debt you claim England owes the United States, but you certainly haven't any moral right to the money. Furthermore, if England paid the United States it would upset international exchange."

"Do you think," inquired Mr. Griffin, "that you could use your influence toward having the British Government offer to give us Bermuda, British Honduras, and other territory it controls, including naval bases in the West Indies, to apply on the war debt?"

That subject was discussed here a few moments ago by a number of Senators.

Lord Cecil said that he would be opposed to England transferring any of that territory to America, because there are British subjects living in those possessions, and he thought it would be a mistake not only for England but for any country to transfer to another government any territory where it had subjects or citizens. Asked why England took the German colonies after the World War, Lord Cecil replied that that was different, because the Germans were a conquered people."

Talk about honesty, good faith, gratitude, and international peace founded on international justice and good will! As a matter of self-respect, self-interest, and plain common sense, it is surely unnecessary to stress the imperative need of Uncle Sam



making those trans-Atlantic superracketeers liquidate their indebtedness and their obligations.

I have told you, Mr. President, about the taxi driver, and the fact that he wants the war debts collected. Besides what he said, which sums up what a number of persons have told me, I have received literally hundreds of letters from over the Nation in the past few weeks, totaling thousands altogether; and I should like to have every American citizen write me his or her opinion about the war debts, and to write every single Member of Congress about the war debts, because I want the people's representatives in Congress to be reminded of what they already know, that the American people are vitally interested in collecting the debts from Europe, in order that that money may be utilized here at home at a time when we need it. Nearly every letter coming in mentions the war debts, Mr. President. The American people are vitally interested in them, and they are somewhat bewildered by the fact that we do not try to collect them. They are honest, God-fearing folks who pay their own bills and know that when they borrow money they have to pay it back. This is the American system. They cannot understand this European system of borrowing from a neighbor's cash box and then thumbing your nose when it comes time to pay back. Every farmer knows that if he mortgages his farm, either the bank or the Government will grab it if he does not pay off.

Look at what the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation do when a debtor gets in arrears. They crack down, just like a business house. Is there any logical reason why we should not crack down on our debtors across the seas?

Is it not our obligation and duty as Senators of the United States to look out for America and Americans? Is it not our responsibility to look after our country and our citizens first? I think it is, and because I think so, I cannot understand this talk about levying new taxes on more of our own people and standing silently by while our foreign debtors default every June 15 and December 15. I cannot understand all this talk about increasing the limit of debt we can pile up in bonds, and not making an effort to collect the \$13,000,000,000 the other nations owe us, and using that money to pay off our Government bonds.

I am convinced that if these war debts were to be collected, a lot of our economic ailments could be cured almost instantly. For example, we hear cried on every hand that the 3,000,000 or so little-business men cannot get working capital because the banks are all stuffed up with Federal bonds. Those bonds earn money while they are lying in the vaults. That is the interest burden the American taxpayers have to pay in our National Budget. If we collected the war debts and paid off those bonds, the banks would have to put that money to work. Currency loafing in a vault does not produce more money. It would be available for the banks to lend to business, to make jobs for the millions of unemployed. Those jobs would do away with W. P. A. and these other necessary relief expenditures. Payment of the war debts would pay the costs of W. P. A. for 10 years.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The trouble is, is it not, that for 25 years or thereabouts we have been placing Europe first and America last, and is it not about time that we say "America first and forever"?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I quite agree with the Senator. I think we should turn our eyes homeward. I think we should consider America and its citizens first, and the taxpayers of America are demanding today that we do something about that. We have to have some help. We have to levy taxes so long as conditions remain as they are. We are doing all we can. It is nobody's fault in particular; it is just one of the things that happens, but why cannot we have some help for the taxpayers of the country?

Our Budget could be cut pretty sharply. We spend over a billion dollars a year now in interest charges on the national debt. If we did not have that interest to pay, we could cut that item out of the Budget and we could cut it out of the tax bill we give millions of American citizens and businesses every year. We could also cut out of the tax bill the cost of relief if our men and women had jobs. We tax our people to pay interest on bonds sold to get money to lend Europe—and cannot collect from Europe even the interest.

Our citizens have to pay their tax bill—their debt to this Government—or they will have Uncle Sam's collectors of the Bureau of Internal Revenue knocking on the front door. Let us see if we cannot get Europe to pay its bill to the United States—and send our collector over there to rap on the door. That looks like the only way we will ever get it. We cannot be Santa Claus to the world, because the bag of gifts ultimately will empty. America cannot carry the world forever without collapsing. As rich as we are with God's gifts in resources, the fountain from which all these blessings flow will dry up.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I hope sincerely that some serious consideration may be given to the resolution mentioned by me in reference to the appointment of Mr. Griffin as special war-debt envoy to Europe. Let us send someone to Europe to knock on the door of the debtor nations every hour of the day, if necessary, at least to remind them that we have not forgotten about the debt and that 130,000,000 people in this country who are bearing the burden are expecting relief from those so-called friends across the blue waters of the Atlantic.

#### AMERICA FIRST, ABSOLUTE NEUTRALITY

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, from time to time, even though my motives or intentions may be misconstrued by these men whom I respect, by these Senators whom I have

learned to love as colleagues on the floor of this great body, I am going to refer to the British debt, French debt, the German debt, and the other European debts. In that connection, how are we going to get back the money we loaned to Austria? How are we going to get back the money we loaned to Czechoslovakia? How are we going to get back the money we loaned to Poland? What sort of a foreign policy is that? How are we going to get back the money we loaned to Mussolini, even after the war, and the money we loaned to Italy before the close of the war, and on which, under the debt settlement, we were to receive an interest rate of approximately one-tenth of 1 percent during the first 10 years of the 62-year period? I know of no American who can finance his home and fireside at one-tenth of 1 percent on the money borrowed; but the Italian people can do so, Mussolini's Fascist government can do so, under the foreign policy of this Government. I do not consider that American-minded. I consider that foreign-minded. I consider that European-minded. I hope we shall turn back to the American scene and once more begin to think of our unemployed, once more think of our problems at home; and I shall use the best that is in me to aid Senators in the solution of those great problems.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I regret to detain the Senate at this late hour. I do so only through an unwillingness to let this week's debate come to a conclusion, especially in view of the speeches made today and yesterday and the day before, without reminding the Senate and the country briefly of some of the things that ought to be mentioned here. Just a little later—it will only be a few minutes later—I wish to refer to and discuss the statements of former President Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Clark], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Frazier], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Lundeen], and perhaps some other Senators during the course of this debate have, by insinuation and intimation of all kinds, left the conclusion in some minds—I will not say they have endeavored to do it—that the United States was dragged into the World War by the propagandists, by the bankers, and by the munition manufacturers. No direct charge has been made as to that; but by insinuation and by intimation and by ratiocination and roundabout argument it is intimated that we did not go into the World War voluntarily of our own will, but that we were dragged in by the propagandists.

Mr. President, I desire to express my resentment and my denunciation of any such claim. I resent it and denounce it in the name of the Government of the United States at that time. I resent it and denounce it in the name of Woodrow Wilson, lofty character and majestic leader during that terrible period. I resent it and denounce it in the name of the Congress of the United States. I resent it and denounce it in the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Borah], who was here and voted for the declaration of war. I resent it and denounce it in the name of the Senator from California [Mr. Johnson], who was here and voted for that declaration. I resent it and denounce it in the name of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNary].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I appreciate the compliment, but I was not here at that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was not here, but he was in agreement with the sentiment that led to the declaration. I thought he was here at the time; but I withdraw the name of the Senator from Oregon. But other distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle were here; and I resent and denounce the insinuation in the name of many Members of the House and of the Senate on this side of the aisle who were in one of the Houses then and are in one of the Houses now.

The idea of claiming that propaganda got us into the World War. The propaganda that got us into the World War was the German submarine. The propaganda that led us into the World War was the blood of American citizens, shed through murder upon the high seas. That is the kind of propaganda that got us into the World War. We endured

almost 3 years of the World War before America reluctantly entered it. Nobody in this country wanted to get into that war. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is right about our attitude then, just as he is right about our attitude today. America did not want to go into the World War. We stayed out of the World War after one outrage which we endured, and then another outrage which we endured, and more American blood spilled upon the high seas, and more American vessels sunk, until at last the Kaiser, in a defiant and insolent edict, after repeatedly murdering our citizens, undertook to tell us where, and where only, American ships and American citizens could travel on the high seas. That is the kind of propaganda that led us into the World War.

Senators, everybody knows that the munitions makers did not influence us into entry into that war. Those of us who were here in 1917 and those of us who were not here but who read and understand, knew then, and know now, that the munitions makers and the bankers did not drag us into the World War. We were dragged in by repeated insults and repeated outrages, and repeated murder of American citizens.

Mr. President, I am amazed at my distinguished friend the Senator from Minnesota. I attribute to him every sincerity in his views, but the Senator from Minnesota says he is against the embargo because he wants peace; he does not want conquest; he does not want bloody warfare. Yet, while England is in a struggle with Germany, with her enemy, he advocates sending our Army and Navy down and taking the Bahamas and taking the other West Indian islands, and taking other possessions of the British Empire, by force and by conquest—this man of peace, this Senator who will not vote to repeal the embargo because he is against getting us into war.

Mr. President, that is not a lofty attitude to take. If I wanted the islands of the seas, I would not wait until England was in a death grip with an enemy and then undertake to take advantage of her misfortune and, by force of arms, to ravish her of many of her possessions. If I wanted them, I would sit down with her around the table and negotiate in peace; negotiate through the methods of mediation, rather than by armed force to take them while she was in dire extremities.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It seems to me that we have been sitting around the table for 20 years. Jackson waited until about 25 years had passed. Perhaps in 5 years more we will take some decided action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator, did I misquote him in saying that he advocated striking England when she was locked in a death embrace with her enemy, to take a big army and navy and take these islands? Did he not say that?

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the Senator will permit me, I will say to him that I am thinking about the United States, and not where England may be. We have talked to her for 20 years, and now is the time to act. We have demanded and demanded, and she has refused to do anything about it. Now let us show that there is some red blood in us. These islands are all on our own American coasts, they are really American islands. We need them for naval bases, we need them for aircraft bases. We do not want the Germans or anybody else to get them. Now is the time to acquire them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Now is the time to grab them, according to the Senator from Minnesota, while England is not looking, while Germany has her down, with a knife at her throat, and she cannot resist. Now is the time for a great nation like ours to go out with its army and navy and take these possessions away from a friendly power.

Mr. President, think of it. The Senator from Minnesota covers our position in the World War all over with slime and abuse. He is unwilling to have the United States fight a foreign power because of the murder of his own fellow citizens, the shedding of their innocent blood; yet he is willing to plunge this Nation into war to grab some of the islands in the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I think the Senator will have to agree with me that I am sustained in my judgment of the World War by the general opinion of the American public and of all writers and historians of any note. There is no question now on that point; and let me say when we seize the West Indies not a shot will be fired; there will be no war over the West Indies.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with any such conclusion. The Senator from Texas was here at that time; he was a Member of the House of Representatives with the Senator from Minnesota. He was made a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the first act he had to take as a new Congressman was to vote on a declaration of war. God knows I did not want to vote for a declaration of war. God knows I went through travail of spirit and of conscience and of humility before my God before I ever voted for war. I voted for war. I felt then that it was a righteous cause. I felt that we ought to go to war, and I am not going to apologize for that record. I have nothing to retract. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] a few days ago stated that if American citizens were murdered on the high seas, if our property were attacked and destroyed, he would again vote for a declaration of war.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I suggest to the Senator from Texas that listening to the Senator from Minnesota tell about our need at the present time for these islands in the Caribbean reminds me of what I have been reading in the last 2 or 3 weeks of what Mr. Molotoff has told the Lithuanians and the Estonians and the Finnish people about the need of Russia for the islands in the Baltic.

Mr. CONNALLY. And Sweden.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. And after they get through with Finland they are going to say in the same way in which they have said it to these other nations, "We need these various possessions around Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and therefore, no matter what happens, we are justified in going and taking them."

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Washington for that suggestion. The same kind of a land hunger that prompts the Senator from Minnesota to want us to grab these West Indian Islands, and to grab Canada, perhaps, the same sort of appetite is stirring within the digestive organs of the Soviet, and it looks around over the Baltic and says, "Here is a good island for defensive purposes. Here is some more territory for an airplane or a great naval base. Here is some territory for an airfield. It belongs to Finland, but what do we care? We want it, and we are going to get it."

Here is a place over in Sweden. Sweden is a great, peaceful nation. It wants to pursue the paths of happiness and prosperity undisturbed. But when the Soviet Union comes over, with 180,000,000 people behind it, and with an army of two or three million men, with a swarm of airplanes and tanks, and tells Sweden, "We want some of your territory, some bases, some land, and some advantages," what is poor Sweden to say? She will say, "I have not much of an army, any munition plants, any airplane factories. You have all you need, Mr. Stalin, and I cannot buy any from the United States, this great neutral power. She sold you yours in time of peace, but now, in time of war, I cannot get any weapons with which to defend myself against this aggressor."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am astonished—

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not the first time the Senator has been astonished.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am astonished at the statement of the Senator from Texas that Sweden has no munition plants. She has one of the greatest munition plants anywhere in the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. She has the Bofors munitions plant, but out of a well-rounded sense of protecting herself



she has embargoed the export of munitions during the time of war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Senator know why Sweden does that? It is for her own defense. She has the munitions, but does not want to sell them because there is old Russia hanging over her like a hungry hawk, ready to pounce down upon her and devour her.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Great Britain is not the only country that has some islands in the Western Hemisphere. France has some. I think she owns Martinique.

Mr. CONNALLY. She owns Martinique.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why, just take England's islands? France owes us some money, too.

Mr. CONNALLY. In all fairness, I think the Senator from Minnesota meant France, too.

Mr. BARKLEY. Italy also owns some islands. Why not be brave, and take them now before she gets into the war?

Mr. CONNALLY. Why not go over and take Ethiopia and repopulate it with some of our own citizens here at home? [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I was not in the Chamber during all of the debate. Did the Senator from Texas say that the Senator from Minnesota advocates the United States Government going down and taking over these islands?

Mr. CONNALLY. With the Army and Navy.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Texas knows, I suppose, that since the Senator from Minnesota has been in the Senate he has voted every year against appropriating a single dollar for the United States Navy. How would we send the Navy if we did not vote something with which to build one?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator if he desires to reply—briefly, I hope.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am glad the Senator from South Carolina is keeping such close track of my record; but I think he will have to correct his statement a little.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, has the Senator ever voted for a naval appropriation bill since he has been in the Senate?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes; I have.

Mr. BYRNES. When?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Let the Senator check up on the record.

Mr. BYRNES. I did check upon it, and I will advise the Senator in a moment whether I am correct or not.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I supported the original Navy bill which came in, which our admirals said was sufficient; but I did not extend support to the additional billion-dollar bill, and I so stated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, did the Senator vote for the expansion of the Navy bill this year?

Mr. LUNDEEN. No; I did not.

Mr. BYRNES. He was opposed to that?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES. But he is willing to send the Navy down to South America?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I am willing to stand on that. So far as that is concerned, we have an ample navy, as stated by the admirals and the naval authorities, for taking care of anything concerning the Monroe Doctrine, without any of these bugaboo appropriations, supported by people who see things in the attic at night. They come here and want a certain appropriation bill passed, but that is inadequate, and they then within a week get on the long-distance telephone and talk to Europe so much they want another billion. I should like to know how many long-distance telephone calls to Europe there were, and how much has been expended on them. We might almost build a battleship with that telephone money, I think. Let me quote the first and greatest of

all our Presidents on overgrown naval and military establishments:

Hence, likewise they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty.

Mr. BYRNES. Has the Senator from Texas inquired as to who has been talking to Europe and to whom they have been talking?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will do so in just a moment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I desire to ask two or three questions. As I understand, the Senator from Minnesota has suggested that we seize land from England in payment of debts. Would that mean war?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am going to answer that.

Mr. WILEY. Will not the Senator answer "yes" or "no" for the moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. It would ultimately mean war, unless England should crawl under the bed.

Mr. WILEY. As I recall, a good many of the South American countries are seriously indebted to the people of this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. And those debts are in default.

Mr. CONNALLY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WILEY. Should we follow the same reasoning, in collecting those debts, and take some of the South American countries?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is some slight difference. One is a private debt and the other is a public debt. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin, however.

Of course, Mr. President, I want to express my utter dissent from any such doctrine as a conquest with the Army and Navy of England's possessions while she cannot defend herself because, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, though she might for the moment not be able to defend herself, she would, whenever she was able to, resent such an exploitation or such a conquest, and we would be inextricably involved in difficulties with the British Empire for taking advantage of her in her hour of distress, in her hour of danger, to ravish some of her most choice possessions.

Mr. President, I want to discuss just one or two other matters, and I am through. I do not want this week's debate to end without making a brief recapitulation of some of the things that this embargo repeal means.

What does the embargo do? It penalizes peaceful nations and encourages aggressor nations. The embargo invites aggressors to prepare for conquest with the assurance that when they do prepare and when they strike their victims shall not get any weapons of defense or offense, if you want to make a distinction, in order to defend their lives.

The opponents of repeal say that to lift the embargo will help Great Britain and France. That is one of the favorite phrases used here. One of the mouth-filling platitudes that is rolled around the tongues of those who oppose repeal is—"Repeal will help Great Britain and France."

By the same character of logic it inevitably follows that to keep the embargo helps Hitler and Stalin.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas, together with other Senators, helped to put the embargo law on the statute books. So does the Senator mean now that we are helping Hitler and Stalin because of a law which the Senator and his administration put on our statute books? He was wrong then, and the Senator from Texas may be wrong now.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not the first time the Senator from Texas has made a mistake. He makes many of them. But when he has found that he has made a mistake, he tries to correct it. Some people never do. There are those who, like the Hapsburgs, "never learn anything and never forget anything."

Mr. President, it is said that we are choosing sides between the warring states if we repeal the embargo. The embargo does choose sides. Unwittingly, inadvertently, when we passed the embargo we chose sides in this contest, and we chose the side of Hitler and Stalin, and I am unwilling any longer to be in that sort of partnership. I propose to repeal the law and go back where we were before. We had the power to pass the embargo law when we passed it, and we have the same power now to repeal it that we had then to pass it. It is a fine argument to say that Congress had a perfect right to pass it but now has no right to repeal it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is no doubt that a domestic law can develop so as to be unneutral and unequal in its operation as between belligerents, as this one has.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is equally true, is it not, that not having a law cannot be unneutral?

Mr. CONNALLY. To be sure. The Senator from Nevada is correct. We passed this embargo act unwittingly and with not the proper foresight, not with clear enough vision, not with a view away down the road; we passed it as a handsome and beautiful gesture of peace, but we now find that the operation of this domestic law, a law purely for the control of our citizens and our ships, has put us in a position where we are not neutral in this war, but to all intents and purposes we are aiding Stalin and Hitler.

We have now a perfect right to repeal that domestic regulation and put ourselves right back where we were under international law. While under the joint resolution we give up nothing of our rights under international law, while we surrender not a jot or tittle under international law, yet as an added precaution, merely in the interest of preventing incidents that might provoke war, we do say, and we have the right to say to our citizens, "You must not travel on the seas to belligerent countries. You must not use our ships to transport goods to belligerent countries." That has nothing to do with international law. International law is just what it was before, and the proposed act is purely a domestic regulation.

Mr. President, I want the country to know that under the operation of the present embargo Italy can buy all the guns, ammunition, tanks, bombing planes, and other aircraft that she can get in the United States. Russia, still technically a neutral country, can come to our shores and buy cannon, arms, tanks, rifles, and airplanes, and she can carry them back to Russia. Under the present embargo law, theoretically she cannot transship them to a nation at war. But how can we prevent that?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Can the Senator explain to the Senate why it is that Russia is technically a neutral, inasmuch as the United States Government still recognizes the Republic of Poland, which has been wantonly invaded by Russia in partnership with Germany—why is Russia a neutral, and why has not the President issued a proclamation declaring Russia to be a belligerent just as much as Germany is? A proclamation was issued when Germany invaded Poland. Why is not Russia as much at war with Poland, which we still recognize, as Germany is at war with Poland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will try to explain to the Senator as far as I know it. Russia came in after Germany had already conquered Poland, and then Russia and Germany divided up Poland. So far as I know Russia conducted no real armed operation. She killed no one. She besieged no cities. But, irrespective of the facts, technically she is still a neutral. There has been no declaration of war by Russia. There has been no declaration of war by any other country on Russia. So that today Russia is still technically a neutral.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just let me answer this question before I go to another, and then I shall try to answer the Senator's further question.

So that today Russia is a neutral, and if she can come here, and has money to pay for them, she can buy all the arms, ammunition, and implements of war she wants to. But it is said she cannot transship them. How can the United States Government go into Russia and see where those arms go? How can we go into Italy and see whether those identical arms are transported to Germany or not? If we undertake to do it, it would bring us to the brink of war. Talking about involvement we would get involved by sending our snoopers, spies, and agents, and undertaking to trace what happened to these arms, ammunitions, and implements of war that would go to Russia and to Italy. That is what would be done under the embargo. And yet we cannot sell a single weapon or munition to France or to England, countries that are on the other side in this war. Is that neutrality? I ask the Senator from Missouri, is that neutrality in fact?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not agree at all with the premise of the Senator from Texas. I say that under the plain provision of the present neutrality law now on the statute books it ought to be illegal to export any arms to Russia. The Senator from Texas says there has been no declaration of war by Russia. The Senator from Texas says there has been no declaration of war by any power against Russia.

Mr. President, there is not a syllable in the present neutrality act referring to "a declaration of war." The language of the present neutrality act is "when a state of war exists," and a state of war does not exist. It says:

When the President shall find that a state of war exists.

There is no question about it. The President has to proclaim it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; the President has to proclaim it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why does not the President proclaim it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does not the Senator go down occasionally to see the President of the United States and find what is going on?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the place to find out is in this Chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the trouble with the Senator from Missouri. He wants to insulate himself in a sublimated atmosphere of isolation and self-consideration. Why does he not go down to the White House occasionally and find out?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly the Senator from Texas will not contend that any Member of this body or anyone who has ever been a Member of this body is more addicted to self-consideration than the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Missouri for that expression. I do not get much from the Senator from Missouri, and I have to get a little of my own.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator deals well with himself at all times.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. It may be thought that the statute provides that the President shall apply an embargo when a state declares war. That is not the wording. It shall be applied when a foreign country is in "a state of war." There is no question that Russia is in no state of war now. But if there is any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Missouri about Russia, there cannot be any doubt in his mind about Italy. He would certainly not have the President declare that Italy is now in a state of war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to answer the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say there is no reason on earth why the same rule cannot be applied to Italy, so far as the transshipment of goods is concerned, that was so success-



fully applied to Loyalist Spain. The National Munitions Board in numerous instances, as shown by their report, very successfully prevented the export of munitions to Greece and to Latvia and to other countries where they had reason to believe the goods were to be transshipped to Loyalist Spain. I do not see why it is not as easy to apply this rule successfully against transshipment to Italy and Rumania, if it is permitted to remain in the law as it is at present, as it was to apply the provision of the present law to transshipment through Greece.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is referring to one little country near Spain and another little country. Another fact is there we trusted to Mr. Green, of the State Department, to decide from the evidence whether or not nationals of France were guilty of transshipping goods. We had considerable diplomatic trouble over it, and if it had involved a big offender, we would have had Mr. Green of the State Department getting this country into a tremendous controversy. If Mr. Green tried to pass on the evidence as to whether or not Russia and Italy were shipping stuff into Germany we would have a great deal more trouble; in fact, we would be messing in the domestic affairs of neutral countries.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas does not recede one inch from the statement he made. The statement was that Russia is now technically a neutral.

Here is this wonderful embargo, all ornamented by the labors of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. What does it do? It provides that whenever the President shall find that a state of war exists he shall proclaim it, and so forth. There has been no proclamation with respect to Russia. So far as I know, there will not be any, and until such a proclamation is made, as I said a moment ago, Russia may buy in the United States all the arms, ammunition, and implements of war she can pay for, and she may take them to Russia. Imagine, after they get to Russia, somebody going around, following them up, and seeing where they go. It is preposterous and ridiculous.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. There has been considerable discussion for a long time about the question of a proclamation with reference to a state of war. I think it is about time that some understanding be reached as to the reasons why the words "a state of war" were inserted in the original law.

The arms embargo was written by those who are now opposed to its repeal, and those who insist that no discretion be granted to the President which can possibly be avoided. They were the ones who insisted upon the law being worded "a state of war" instead of simply "war." The reasons they gave for insisting upon the words "a state of war" rather than the word "war" were that they did not want the President to have an opportunity to use any discretion about it, and that the words "a state of war" had a definite meaning in international law. They meant that there was a declaration of war between the two belligerents, or a blockade of one belligerent by another belligerent.

Those who are now insisting that the embargo be continued, and those who throughout the past year have consistently criticized the President for his failure to proclaim the embargo in reference to Japan and China, for example, are the ones who themselves, because they did not want to give the President any more discretion than they possibly could avoid, insisted upon the use of that technical language. That is the reason why Russia is technically a neutral today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the Senator's time; but will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri. However, and in order to avoid what may seem an offense to some individual Senator later, I ask Senators please to refrain from interruptions after the Senator from Missouri

shall have finished, because I wish to conclude. The hour is growing late.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the Senator's time unduly; but, in response to what the Senator from Washington has said, I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I never advanced any such argument as he has just suggested, and I do not know of anyone else who did. The reason why the term "state of war" was used was specifically to get away from the contention which has since been made, that it is necessary to have a declaration of war. What we were driving at was to make the act operative whenever a state of war existed, such as the invasion of China by Japan, or the invasion of Poland by Russia, without war being formally declared, because we realized that there would be many undeclared wars.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the matter to which the Senator from Washington referred.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Washington says we were applying the language to two specific situations, neither one of which, he says, applies in this case.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri was not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee at the time the original act was passed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was not; but I was the one who introduced the first resolution.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. That is correct. The Senator was one of the original introducers of the resolution; and behind the use of the technical words "state of war" was the motive that it was not desired to give the President any discretion in the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall observe the injunction of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; but if the situation between Russia and Poland, as we all understand it, should compel the President to issue a proclamation, then the situation which existed between Germany and Austria, when Germany invaded Austria and took possession of it, would have justified a proclamation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. When Germany took the Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, and Moravia, the President could have issued a proclamation forbidding the sale of arms to Germany or any of her allies. So the situation as between Poland and Russia is parallel to the other situations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. Of course, the parallels are exact and accurate. The conditions in the two countries to which he referred are comparable to the conditions in Poland, except that Germany did not take all of Poland. She took only part of it. In the other cases she took all of Austria and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. President, the arms embargo we now have denies to Great Britain and France their natural advantages on the sea, while leaving to Hitler and Stalin all of their natural advantages on the land.

Let me remind the Senate that under the Embargo Act today any neutral country may buy arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and may then reship them to Germany or to her ally, Russia. Under the embargo, everything except arms, ammunition, and implements of war may now be transported in American vessels to a nation at war with the practical certainty that the American vessels will be sunk, and we shall be brought to the very brink of war. The Embargo Act places the United States in an unneutral position by reason of what has happened since its passage, as was so well pointed out by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

In the World War it was not the kind of cargo carried in our ships that caused them to be sunk. They did not carry arms. They did not carry munitions. They carried general cargo and American seamen. They were sunk. The Kaiser sank them then, and Hitler will sink them now. That is why the joint resolution provides for taking our ships off the sea so far as belligerent nations are concerned.

Mr. President, the opponents of repeal constantly and sedulously start out with the assumption which the Senator from Wisconsin so well pointed out a while ago. They start out with the assumption that the embargo means peace. I deny

the assumption, and I defy them to present arguments rather than statements. The embargo does not mean peace. It most probably means war. But they say it is the first step. Ah, Mr. President. It is not the first step toward war. It is more likely the first step toward peace.

Before war may be declared by the United States, Congress, by a majority vote of both Houses, must take that step. Only 49 Senators are required to keep the United States from going into war; and so long as the Senate does not want a war there is no power on earth to put the United States into war. So after all, we have to rely upon the patriotism, wisdom, judgment, and caution of the American Congress and the American people. Repeal of the arms embargo does not mean war. It means pulling us back from the brink of war to which the embargo, if permitted to remain on the books as it is now written, will most surely bring us.

So I wish to deny the "first-step" argument, which is merely an assumption and nothing else. It has been hammered into the minds of those who accept it as a fact that the embargo means peace, and that repeal of the embargo means war. I utterly deny that contention, and I challenge the opponents of repeal to present something more than mere statements, iteration, and reiteration to support it.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] bases most of his argument on the theory of "changing the rule after the game begins." I attempted to point out that we are not undertaking to change international law. It remains as it has always remained. We are simply, by domestic legislation, regulating the conduct of our own citizens. All the authorities on international law confirm and ratify that statement and contention.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to Mr. Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh. I have their statements before me. I give these gentlemen every credit for sincerity and for a desire to keep us out of war. However, both Mr. Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh recognize that the United States should sell defensive weapons to all the nations at war which can come and get them. I start with that premise, and if any Senator wants to deny it, I ask him now to deny it.

Mr. Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh start out with the premise that we should sell the nations at war defensive weapons.

Mr. President, it follows logically that we should sell them any kind of weapons they can come and get. Why? Because there is no distinction between offensive and defensive weapons.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I dislike to interrupt the Senator; but on that point, if I correctly understand the addresses, did not both the eminent gentlemen to whom the Senator has referred indicate that sales of defensive weapons should be without any restriction whatever, that they might be on credit, and might be transported in American vessels? I am asking for information.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the statement of Colonel Lindbergh before me. If the Senator cares to examine it I shall be glad to yield to him later.

Irrespective of that point, Mr. President, Colonel Lindbergh and Mr. Hoover say that the United States ought to sell weapons for defense to the nations at war. That cannot be done under the arms embargo. It cannot be done under the present law. It can be accomplished only by a repeal, in part at least, of the present arms embargo.

Let us see what is the difference between defensive and offensive weapons. What are the kinds of weapons? Suppose we are attacked by a fleet of tanks: How shall we meet those tanks? We shall meet them either with cannon or with other tanks. In the one case the tank is offensive, and in the other case it is defensive, although the tanks may be of the same kind, the same make, and with the same caliber guns. The weapons are identical, but they may be used either for offense or for defense.

Take the case of a bombing plane: Mr. Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh say that bombing planes can be used only for offense.

Mr. President, let us suppose that two great armies are struggling for supremacy. Why is it not legitimate in defense for one of the armies to send out its bombing planes and bomb the other army, which is marching to the attack? Is not that as much a defense as a man shooting somebody with a rifle? Is not that as much a defense as a man touching off a cannon to send a crushing missile across the battlefield to hammer down a fort or destroy human life? Of course. Bombing planes may be used in defense to bomb the contending army.

Here is a munitions plant, turning out daily hundreds of weapons, hundreds of arms, hundreds of guns, rifles, cannon, and airplanes to equip the enemy. Is it not a legitimate defense to send over a bombing plane and destroy that munitions plant or that arms factory in order to defend ourselves against the weapons which are being manufactured for use against us?

Mr. President, there is no justification for the theory that there is any distinction between offensive and defensive weapons. I attribute the difficulty into which Mr. Hoover fell, and the difficulty into which Colonel Lindbergh fell, to a desire to appear to be interested in not having human life destroyed. They meant that on the ground of sentiment; but when they consulted their logic they saw that there was no answer to the idea that it was right and just to sell arms for defense. They paid that tribute to logic and to common sense, and they paid the tribute of their sentiment to banning weapons for offense; but there is no difference between a weapon for defense and a weapon for offense. If I shoot you when you are coming toward me, that may be called defense; if you shoot me when you are coming toward me, that is offense; but each one of us is just as dead as if he were shot in defense or offense. There is no distinction whatever.

Talk about airplanes! Are they offensive or defensive weapons? When you send out a fleet of airplanes to make an attack, what are the people who are on the defensive going to do? If they know anything at all, they are going to send out a fleet of airplanes to overcome your fleet, in order to defend themselves against the fleet of airplanes that is attacking. So it is with all of these weapons.

The submarine, I suppose, is a purely defensive weapon. The Germans claim that it is. They say they are defending themselves by destroying their enemies' commerce and keeping their enemies from being munitioned and supplied; but the submarine is the most powerful offensive weapon known to the sea. It lies in wait for its victim, and then, with a deadly weapon, a deadly torpedo, sends the ship and its cargo and its human freight down to the uttermost bowels of the earth. Defensive? Yes. Offensive? Yes. The only way in which we could make the distinction would be to write on one of them, "This is for defense," and write on the other on, "This is for offense." [Laughter.] That is all it would amount to. When you issued the bill of lading you would say, "We are shipping these guns over for defense. We will not ship any of them over for offense, but they are the same kind of guns; they are the same kind of weapons; and while we send them over to you for defense, after you get them you may do what you please with them."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose we imagine two airplanes in combat over Europe, one of them belonging to the German Army and the other to the French Army. Suppose the German plane had been sold by somebody in the United States and had been marked "This plane is for offense," while the French plane had been bought in this country from the same factory, and it had marked on it, "This plane is for defense." Suppose the offensive plane pursues the defensive plane for a certain length of time, and then they turn, and the offensive plane starts home, and the defensive plane starts after it in pursuit. Which, then, would be the offensive plane, and which would be the defensive plane?



Mr. CONNALLY. I will state that in answering that question I need all the offense and all the defense that I can get. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the defensive plane would be violating our interpretation of international law if, in order to defend itself, it turned and pursued the offensive plane.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

I think this theory about offensive weapons and defensive weapons is somewhat comparable to the transshipment clause in the present embargo law. It says, "You may not take arms and munitions to a neutral country and transship them"; but who is going to trace the transshipment? If we sell airplanes over there for defense only, it is going to be our business, according to the theory of these gentlemen, to go over there and see that the purchasers do not use them for anything except for defense.

Mr. President, the attempted distinction is one that does not exist. It may exist in the fanciful imagination of some dreamer or some thinker; but out in the cold realities of war, out in the cold realm of fact, it does not exist. Every weapon is both an offensive and a defensive weapon; and when Mr. Hoover and Colonel Lindbergh say that it is right to ship to the nations at war defensive weapons, they argue for the repeal of the embargo. If it is right to send defensive weapons, then it is right to send offensive weapons, because they are the same type. They are the same instrumentality. If it is right to send them for defense, it is also right to send them for war purposes generally.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator is interested in the exact words Colonel Lindbergh uses, I will state that he does not even say "sell." He uses peculiar language. He says:

As far as purely defensive arms are concerned, I, for one, am in favor of supplying European countries—

And so forth.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. He makes no restriction whatever.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. This is what Colonel Lindbergh says:

As far as purely defensive arms are concerned, I, for one, am in favor of supplying—

Not selling; not demanding gold on the barrel head, but supplying—supplying—

European countries with as much as we can spare of the material that falls within this category.

There are technicians who will argue that offensive and defensive arms cannot be separated completely.

The colonel was smart enough to realize that people who know about weapons—he knows about them in a general way, of course—he realized that technicians would say that they could not be distinguished. Why, of course not. Military and naval men know that, and Colonel Lindbergh in his heart knows it, or he would not have felt obliged to argue the point in his speech when nobody had raised it on him. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, Mr. Hoover's statement is in substantial agreement with Colonel Lindbergh's statement. I rather suspect that Colonel Lindbergh had read Mr. Hoover's statement before he made his own. That is one reason why I asked the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] who it was, if he knew, that was collaborating and cooperating with Colonel Lindbergh in the preparation of his statements. I have great admiration for Colonel Lindbergh for his great feat in spanning the ocean; but, in all seriousness, I do not think that achievement alone qualifies him to overrule the views of the great military and naval authorities and other persons who, in this Chamber and the other Chamber, have been investigating these matters, some of them perhaps before Colonel Lindbergh was born, and are somewhat familiar with them.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES. Does not the Senator think that is a matter on which we ought to get the opinion of "Wrong Way" Corrigan? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I am afraid Colonel Lindbergh has already been consulting "Wrong Way" Corrigan, because Colonel Lindbergh has shown a disposition to go in the wrong direction, at least half the time, in this statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I desired to review these matters for the benefit of the country. I wanted to repel these insinuations and these base slanders about the way in which the United States entered the World War. I wanted to denounce the reflections upon the Congress and upon the President and upon the American people, and the imputation that that was a dishonorable war.

I respect those who had the courage to vote against our entrance into the war, of course. I admire their fine motives. But, so far as I am concerned, I have no apology to make, and I never have made one for the vote to go into the World War after repeated instances of the murder of our citizens, and after their blood had reddened the seven seas.

Mr. President, I wish to repudiate and denounce again the idea that we are going to be dragged into the present war by propaganda. Are Senators or Members of the House of Representatives to be influenced by propaganda to take our country into the war? Are they insensible to the interests of our country? Are they deaf to the pleas of our people to keep our country out of the war?

Why are we enacting this legislation? It is not with the purpose of getting us into war; it is to keep us out of war. By this measure we are saying to American citizens, "You cannot travel to nations at war." We are telling American shipping interests, "You cannot go to nations at war. You cannot take any article or commerce whatever to nations at war." We go further than that; we give the President the power to superimpose on top of that a declaration of combat areas, and when they are once established, no citizen and no ship can go into those combat areas.

Were those portions of the joint resolution devised as a first step into war? Is it the purpose of those provisions to make a choice between the belligerents? No, Mr. President; this is an American bill, for Americans, written by Americans, and it is going to be passed by Americans. Its purpose is to maintain our rights, and yet to keep this country out of the present World War.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, Colonel Lindbergh delivered his second address on a national radio broadcast on yesterday. It is the second time he has advised the people of the United States as to their welfare and as to what their national policy should be. His address was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning. For a very few moments I desire to give my analysis of his radio address of yesterday.

Colonel Lindbergh brought glory to the United States through his courage and skill in pioneering a successful solo flight across the Atlantic. We respect and admire Colonel Lindbergh for his accomplishments and his high character. History does not disclose that Colonel Lindbergh has had the same experience in statesmanship and military affairs he has had in flying, although his address in its learned expressions indicates a remarkable intuition:

Summing up in his address, Colonel Lindbergh says:

I believe that we should adopt as our program of American neutrality as our contribution to western civilization the following policy:

1. An embargo on offensive weapons and munitions.
2. The unrestricted sale of purely defensive armaments.
3. The prohibition of American shipping from the belligerent countries of Europe and their danger zones.
4. The refusal of credit to belligerent nations or their agents.

An embargo on offensive weapons and munitions: Apparently, to Colonel Lindbergh's mind, a bomb is an offensive weapon, and yet our military experts tell us that bombs carried by airplanes would be one of the strongest defensive weapons against an attack upon our shores by an enemy fleet. Colonel Lindbergh apparently considers an airplane an offensive weapon, because he desires the export of such

weapon embargoed. Our military experts consider the airplane one of the strongest defensive weapons we have, and our Congress has approved this opinion by appropriating money for one of the largest aerial programs in history.

As I understand, Colonel Lindbergh has approved of this great military program for the defense of our country. Certainly, Colonel Lindbergh, when he gave this advice, did not have in mind that we would use these planes for offensive purposes.

Colonel Lindbergh evidently considers powder an offensive weapon because it is on the embargo list. I cannot conceive how any country could defend itself successfully today without powder and explosives. Colonel Lindbergh evidently does not consider that gasoline and oil are offensive weapons because they are not on the embargo list; and yet the plane which carries the bomb that destroys the lives of innocent people could not operate without gasoline; and the submarine which destroys innocent neutral merchantmen, together with the lives of their seamen on board—without a trace—could not be operated without oil.

Statesmen must strive to be sincere, as well as logical, even in the government of their sentiments.

2. The unrestricted sale of purely defensive armaments: This policy is totally undefined, as becomes evident in the analysis of his No. 1 policy.

3. As to his third policy, that is carried out more strongly in the proposed legislation than was ever before undertaken by this country or any other.

4. As to his fourth policy, the existing law, as well as the proposed law, in accordance with the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States on the Johnson Act, prohibits any credit to belligerent governments, and customary drafts, checks and acceptances are construed as cash.

Colonel Lindbergh says:

I do not believe that repealing the arms embargo would assist democracy in Europe because I do not believe this is a war for democracy.

I do not know what definition Colonel Lindbergh gives to democracies, or what definition he gives to totalitarian powers. There are certainly totalitarian powers in Europe, and there are other powers that are not totalitarian, which are based upon principles of democracy as we understand such principles.

Was Czechoslovakia a democracy? Was Czechoslovakia attempting to defend her democracy, or was Czechoslovakia engaged in power politics?

Was poor Poland mobilizing her forces and attempting to obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purpose of power politics or for the purpose of defending her democracy?

Were Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, through the mobilization of their forces, preparing to defend their form of government, or were such mobilizations for the purpose of power politics?

Germany, before she brought about war against Czechoslovakia and Poland, purchased arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States. Was it right to permit a country preparing for war to obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war; and, when she was prepared, start war, and then prevent her peaceful neighbors from obtaining the same materials for defense by starting war against them?

Are Finland, Norway, and Sweden mobilizing their forces by reason of power politics and a desire for conquest? Is it not evident that they are threatened by conquest, and are seeking to defend their democracies?

Colonel Lindbergh is patriotic, beyond a doubt, yet Colonel Lindbergh sees that the present law injures Great Britain and France, and that its repeal will remove such injury. Apparently he cannot see that the present law not only injures Great Britain and France, but gives great aid to Germany, Italy, and Russia. He cannot see that one of our domestic laws which aids one of the belligerents is unneutral, but he thinks that if we had no law at all that would be unneutral.

The most unfortunate part of Colonel Lindbergh's statement is that it encourages the ideology of the totalitarian gov-

ernments, and is subject to the construction that he approves of their brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or threat of destruction through war.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 16, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, hearken, we beseech Thee, to our prayer, as we confess our sins and ask for guidance through the coming hours. Save us from despairing of the age that presses round us with its questions and denials, and help us to find in each perplexity with which we are confronted only the prelude to the coming of the Son of Man with healing in His wings. If we have closed and barred the doors of our understanding against unwelcome truth, may it return by secret paths and find its way within. Grant that the ears which have heard the voice of Thy songs may be deaf to the voice of clamor and dispute; that the eyes which have seen Thy love, may behold Thy blessed hope; that the feet which have walked in Thy courts may walk only in the region of light, and that the hearts which Thou hast touched may be purified even as by fire. So shall we become masters of ourselves that we may truly serve our country and our God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, October 14, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahay	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Bridges	Green	McNary	Taft
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably detained.